

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ives in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Nellie Tayloe Ross, of Wyoming, to be Director of the Mint (reappointment);

Walter R. Sturr, of Florida, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the fourteenth district of New York, in place of Harry M. Hickey, resigned; and

James M. Robertson, of Norfolk, Va., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 14, with headquarters at Norfolk, Va., in place of Alexander H. Bell, resigned.

RECESS TO 11:30 A. M. MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the order previously entered that when a recess is taken today it be as a mark of respect to the memory of the late President Manuel A. Roxas of the Philippines, I now move that the Senate take a recess until Monday next at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 19, 1948, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 15 (legislative day of March 29), 1948:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Harrington Wimberly, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1953.

Thomas Chalmers Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1952.

THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1948 (reappointments):

Richard L. Disney, of Oklahoma.

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio.

Miss Marion J. Harron, of California.

Samuel B. Hill, of Washington.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Harry B. Liversedge

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Louis E. Woods

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

William L. McKittrick

The following-named officer to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Manuel F. Castro

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 15, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Rev. Russell W. Lambert, minister, First Methodist Church, De Kalb, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Mindful of the tasks before us and our dependence upon Thee for guidance and discernment, we take this moment for quiet communion with Thy spirit.

We are thankful for the wisdom we possess; may we be constantly aware of its source and humbly accept the responsibility it demands of us. We are grateful for the confidence others have placed in us; may we benefit them to the best of our talent and time by serving the commonweal. We are mindful of the blessings of freedom; may it find constant and intense witness in us.

In this day of tired liberty and frustrated vision, let us become apostles of the dynamic heritage that is ours. Let us not be limited to material expression of that which is best demonstrated in spiritual commitment to eternal verities.

Rekindle, O God, the flame of moral freedom: that the future will have light to guide its venture of faith. From an old world we step into a new age; for it we need all the vision Thou canst yield. The horizon's dawn of peace and fellowship is the prayer of millions of Thy children with whom we join in questing hope.

Give us vision to see the glorious road ahead, and, when we see it, Lord help us to have courage enough to walk on it, even alone. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 154. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of the report on supplements 1 and 2 of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism"; and

H. Con. Res. 184. Concurrent resolution amending House Concurrent Resolution 139, Eightieth Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2038. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN] be granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a résumé of New York veteran laws.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two places in the RECORD and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two different subjects and include newspaper articles.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement entitled "Reducing 10 Pounds in 18 Days With Oleo in the Diet."

I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement entitled "Operation Oleo Versus Operation Alaska." I understand a lot of men are needed in Alaska. I make the suggestion that one battalion go to Alaska and attend to that situation and not fight the dairy farmers and spend their time and effort trying to ruin the dairy business by serving oleo instead of butter in the Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HESS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include copies of essays.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Portland Oregonian entitled "First Water for Big Basin."

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Washington Times-Herald of today entitled "Taft-Hartley Surprises."

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. JACKSON of Washington) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include news items.

Mr. MORRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address by Maj. Gen. Philip Fleming, Administrator of the Public Works Agency, given before the Parent-Teacher Association of Dover, N. H.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include stanzas by the Reverend August F. Bender.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

CARE OF OUR ELDERLY CITIZENS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, surely this Eightieth Congress will not close their eyes to the need of our elderly citizens. Through no fault of their own, they have been thrown upon the care of the Government.

These are not idle words when we say that in industrial cities, the earning capacity of our citizens is on the decrease from the age of 45 years. Many industries refuse to hire men over 45 and women over 40 years. Realizing this fact, we certainly can then understand the crying need of legislation that will furnish a real security for the elderly citizens of our great Nation, not based on want and misery, but on right of citizenship and age.

Let us, as Members of the Eightieth Congress realize that the elderly men and women and unemployables can be made an asset in every community, not a tax burden, but citizens with a purchasing power to buy the merchandise that industry can produce.

We cannot, as a nation, afford unemployment and lack of buying power, and let us not forget that profits come from sales; no sales, no profits.

The aged want security, consumers want goods, businessmen want business, manufacturers want orders. These goals cannot be achieved without mass buying.

The cost of old people's homes and public and private charities would be drastically cut. Crime cost would be drastically reduced with the abolition of poverty. Much of the heavy overhead

of the present old-age assistance systems can be saved by the enactment of such a program as offered under the provisions of H. R. 16.

The Townsend bill will save the dreadful cost of depression. Let us not forget that the unemployment during the last depression cost us, in income loss alone, far more than the First World War.

That depression of the thirties cost at least 70,000,000 man-days of production—a loss to the Nation of \$250,000,000,000; enough to buy a \$5,000 home for each of our 10,000,000 veterans, and 40,000,000 other people. Who can compute the cost of depression in lowered morale, broken lives, shattered ideals? Such things causes the destruction of faith in the American's way of life.

We must safeguard that which we hold dear in our American way of life, and see to it that the men and women who as citizens helped make this country great, have real security.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3703) to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after "property", insert "situated within the boundaries of a national park or national monument and."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three instances and include in each newspaper articles.

Mr. DEVITT (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article appearing in the St. Paul Pioneer-Press.

Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution on the Palestine question adopted by the Chelsea City Council.

Mr. POWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an address by H. B. Martin.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

Mr. BREHM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to give testimony on April 15, 1948, at 2 p. m., in the case of the United States against John Howard Lawson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House I am unable to comply with this summons without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the Speaker's desk a copy of the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, CRIMINAL DIVISION
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. JOHN HOWARD LAWSON, NO. 1352-47

TO HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Pennsylvania, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby summoned to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at the District Courthouse in the city of Washington, D. C., on the 15th day of April 1948 at 2 o'clock p. m. to answer to an indictment charging the defendant with violation of title 2, section 192, USCA.

HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By HELEN M. MCINTOSH, Deputy Clerk.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 538) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative HERMAN P. EBERHARTER has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia to testify at 2 p. m. on the 15th day of April 1948 in the case of the *United States v. John Howard Lawson*, Criminal No. 1352-47; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That HERMAN P. EBERHARTER is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial.

"KEEP COLD WITH COOLIDGE"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the heading of this speech should be "Keep Cold With Coolidge."

You remember back in the days when Calvin Coolidge was President there was a slogan, "Keep Cool With Coolidge," and it was used by both Democrats and Republicans with respect for the distinguished gentleman who was then President of the United States.

That slogan should now be changed. They have a lieutenant governor up there named Coolidge. During the last winter they had a very serious fuel shortage up in that country, and the Southern Democrats in Congress did their best to help them get relief. Yet I see this Lieutenant Governor Coolidge comes out in a vicious and unwarranted attack on the people of the Southern States. So I suggest that the slogan now should be "Keep Cold With Coolidge."

There is only one State outside the South and the West that is outside the "iron curtain" of discriminatory freight rates that produces enough oil to supply its own needs and have any to spare, and that is the State of Illinois.

The oil that supplies New England, as a rule, comes from Texas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Alabama, Arkansas, and California. We have done everything we could to help those people in their need, and expect to continue to do so, but it certainly comes with poor grace for the Lieutenant Governor of that State to come out and make a vicious attack on the people of the Southern States at this time.

By his attack he suggests the slogan, for his State, "Keep Cold With Coolidge."

ARTHUR COOLIDGE, LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the gentleman from Mississippi, but Mr. Coolidge is one of the finest men there are in the United States. He thinks more of this country than he does of life itself. Maybe an unfortunate remark was made about North or South Carolina, about taking our business away from Massachusetts, but I want the Members of the House to know that there is no finer man in this country than Arthur Coolidge, Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts. I served with him a great many years in the Massachusetts Legislature, and you would all have the highest respect for him if you knew him.

SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6226, with Mr. O'HARA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, April 14, the Clerk had read down to and including line 5 on page 1. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modification of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories therefor; electronic and communication equipment, detection and warning systems, and specialized equipment; expansion of public plants, and Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants for the foregoing purposes; and personal services necessary for purposes of this appropriation at the seat of the Government and elsewhere; \$608,100,000, of which \$250,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Military Appropriation Act, 1948, to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and, in addition, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized, until June 30, 1949, to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes in an amount not to exceed \$865,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of funds appropriated for the foregoing purposes under the head "Air Corps, Army," in the Military Appropriation Act, 1948, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund which shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That any obligation incurred hereunder shall be subject to the general provisions of the Military Appropriation Act for the fiscal year in which such obligation is incurred.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER to H. R. 6226: Page 2, line 15, strike out "1949" and insert in lieu thereof "1950"; and in line 17, strike out "\$865,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,687,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment to increase the amount for the purchase of airplane contract authorizations because of the seemingly predominant sentiment in favor of the item at this time. As I stated yesterday, I believe in giving the Air Force all that it needs. On the other hand I do not believe in giving it money that it does not need. I believe that the best airplanes will be procured after a detailed hearing on the part of the Committee on Appropriations as to the needs of the service. But that seems impossible with the present feeling in the House. A cursory examination of the break-down submitted to me last evening by the Secretary for Air confirms that feeling. I am satisfied that the Air Force can make savings in the letting of contracts and in the elimination of items that they either cannot get or that they do not need too badly and which really do not contribute to a 70-group force. So that we can approach a 70-group force thoroughly modernized if we provide the \$822,000,000. It will of course need to be supplemented in the years to come. I shall if the Committee on

Appropriations permits follow these programs as closely as possible and do everything possible to see that we get the best results from this program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying that the gentleman has sufficiently modified his opposition to the program for immediate expansion of the Air Force to offer this amendment. But it is to be regretted that he does not include in the amendment the full amount required for the 70-group program. We are only this morning in receipt of an authoritative statement from the Department advising that \$922,000,000 is the minimum amount for which this program can be furnished.

I am going along with the amendment because I believe, as I said yesterday, we should get together on all these provisions with as little division as possible; that we should present a united front in order that both our enemies and our friends abroad understand that the people and the Congress are unitedly back of this program. So, for that reason, although we should provide the full amount at this time, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. How much does this lack in meeting the requirements for a 70-group air force?

Mr. CANNON. According to a statement made this morning by dependable representatives of the Department, it is \$100,000,000 short.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Does the distinguished gentleman from Missouri not think he should inform the House that this is the beginning, the first year's program, of a 5-year procurement program, which will have the objective of creating a 70-group force? This program for the initial year, as carried in this bill, carries \$1,687,000,000. That does not mean we are going to have a 70-group program. That is merely the beginning. Next year, for procurement, we would have to carry in the 1950 budget \$2,738,000,000. In the next year, 1951, we would have to carry for procurement \$3,303,000,000. From then on the annual appropriation for procurement would be \$3,200,000,000. It is the thought of some that in view of the amendment that will be offered providing for renegotiations, it will be possible to commence this 70-group program with an authorization of \$822,000,000, because as you build planes over a length of time, certainly they should grow a little cheaper than if you only order for 1 year. I feel confident, after a thorough study of this matter, that we might be able and will be able to have a 70-group program started and completed with an initial contract authorization of \$822,000,000, and I certainly

trust the House will adopt this amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CANNON. Now, the gentleman has put his finger upon the defect in this amendment. We have grown into the habit in this Congress of legislating and appropriating on the installment plan. No appropriation can be brought in here, regardless of how well supported, but the disposition is to make a feint of saving by arbitrarily cutting it down without reason. And then, later on, when it becomes evident that the amount supplied is insufficient, bring in a hurry-up supplemental bill. That is what is proposed in this amendment. The \$100,000,000 is desperately needed to get these planes in the air in time. There is no reason to cut it out. But they affect to save \$100,000,000 when as a matter of fact it will have to be provided later on, and there will be no saving at all. The only effect will be to delay, by that much, the commitment of the total amount ultimately required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment proposes to cut \$100,000,000 needed for the integrated 70-group program. Judging by past performance on the part of the Committee on Appropriations, this amount will later be brought in as a supplemental appropriation too late to be as effectively used as it could be, and should be, used today.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a time for cheese paring on the expansion and modernization of equipment for the front line of the national defense. The country is in dire peril. We have now less than half the planes Russia already has, and even with this increased program we will not be manufacturing planes as fast as Russia is manufacturing them now. At a time like this when we must ultimately appropriate the extra hundred million, why not appropriate it now?

Any businessman will tell you that he can produce results more quickly, and handle the job more efficiently, if permitted to go ahead and make permanent long-range commitments at the start and thereby save both time and money. Why not follow business-like procedures here and secure more quickly and effectively the air power we so urgently need and which in the near future we may need even more desperately?

We must have this force ready before Russia goes into production of the A-bomb. The War Department announces that Russia already has the secret, she has the know-how; it is merely a matter now of production. We must have this Air Force ready by the time Russia has the A-bomb ready.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I share the gentleman's sentiment 100 percent. I am keenly disappointed personally that they come in here with a proposition to cut the Air Force down a hundred million at this critical time in world affairs. I am glad that the gentleman has used strong language in presenting this matter.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman expresses the practical common sense point of view.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The sum and substance of the gentleman's argument is that he has no objection to the \$22,000,000 and recommends to the House the adoption of \$22,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Half a loaf is better than no bread at all—although we may desperately need the rest of the loaf before we are out of the woods.

This is at least a first installment. We are making the first down payment and will have to make payment on subsequent installments later on. And in the meantime we will pay through the nose in unnecessary delay and additional costs as the installment buyer always does.

Mr. VINSON. And the gentleman's advice to the minority side is to go along with the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from New York of \$22,000,000 which lays down and commences this 70-group air program?

Mr. CANNON. From the beginning, I have attempted to reach accord with the majority members of the subcommittee under which we would as rapidly as possible provide this much needed increment for national defense. So I am going along today, but it should be noted that we are wasting precious time as well as actual cash by deferring appropriation of the \$100,000,000 which we will ultimately have to provide. And by the delay we are losing the benefits accruing from the prompt adoption of a complete long-range program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

I wish first to thank the Appropriations Committee for the prompt consideration they have given the request for additional funds for our Air Forces. I regard our air force as our first line of defense and offense. Since the end of the war our air strength has gone down rapidly and our airplane construction facilities have been greatly reduced. This trend must be reversed and we must take immediate steps to reactivate our airplane industry and build the greatest air force on earth, equal to and ready to meet any emergency.

None of us know how far Russia intends to go, but we do know that our national security may be in peril and that we are not now adequately prepared. There are a number of steps which should be taken without delay and which I regard as urgently needed for our protection and security. These include:

First. An air force superior to all others, with not less than the 70 air groups and 502,000 men recommended by the Secretary of the Air Force. Our present strength is 55 groups with only 353,000 men. I am, therefore, glad to

have the opportunity to support the pending amendment for the appropriation of a total of \$2,300,000,000 for airplane procurement. I hope it will be adopted by a unanimous vote.

Second. The reactivation of our airplane manufacturing plants to begin immediate production of our latest design planes.

Third. A considerable increase in funds for research for airplanes, jet planes, bombers, controlled missiles, and other implements.

Fourth. Increase in the manufacture of atomic bombs.

Fifth. Rapid increase in the procurement and stock piling of critical war materials which are not available in this country.

Sixth. Immediate increase in our Central Intelligence Agency so as to keep informed on what is happening in every part of the world, even behind Russia's iron curtain.

Seventh. Immediate increase of our Regular Army to 1,080,000 men, or 18 divisions, as recommended by General Bradley, now Chief of Staff. On February 1 our Army had only 552,150 men, but we need now a minimum of 18 divisions perfectly trained and fully equipped.

Eighth. Immediate increase of our Navy to about 700,000 men, or the number needed to fully man our ships at sea and get the balance of our Navy out of drydock and ready for action.

Ninth. Immediate increase of our Marine Corps from its present strength of 80,000 to 220,000 men.

Tenth. Immediate passage of a selective service law in order to secure the men needed for these increases in our Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, as it now appears they cannot be secured by volunteers.

Eleventh. Early consideration should be given to a universal military training program. The bill now pending before the House to establish a program of universal military training should be immediately reexamined and reconsidered. Our people cannot feel secure unless they know that there is at all times a thoroughly trained reserve available for call to duty in the event of another emergency. But I seriously doubt the pending bill on universal training can provide such trained reserves. It authorizes a training program for only 6 months. The military authorities have reported that it will require at least 2 weeks to get the boys to camp and assigned to duty and that it will take a week or more to get them discharged. This means that the universal training program as set up in the pending bill would really provide for only 5 months' training. We all know that with the weapons we have now such limited training would be of little benefit and would not produce a trained reserve. In fact, the President's Commission, known as the Compton Committee, which formulated the program for universal military training, very plainly states that such limited training would do more than prepare these boys for home-guard duty and states that if they should be called up for active duty it would still be necessary to

give them intensive and extensive military training. In addition, Secretary of Defense Forrestal testified that it would take 4 years to put this training program into full effect, would cost between three and four billion dollars each year, and would require about 100,000 additional officers and noncommissioned officers to do the training. I think this 6 months bill is misleading the people and causing them to think it is a real defense measure, when in fact the plan set out in the pending bill would probably prove to be no more than expensive play camps for the boys. I believe a sound universal training program can be developed and the House Committee on Armed Services should promptly give further consideration to this proposal.

Twelfth. When we return to the draft we must at the same time pass laws to take the profits out of war and to mobilize industry and every man in the Nation if and when the need arises. We must not again let millions make billions out of war profits while our boys are offering their lives in defense of our country.

And while we are making these preparations for our defense there are two other things we must do; that is:

First. We must work for peace just as earnestly and actively as we prepare for war. It would be the greatest crime of all time if we fail to do everything in our power to establish and maintain lasting peace on earth. Peace is the most precious thing on earth because another war could destroy everything we hold precious and could make the world an unfit place to live in. We must support and try to give strength and power to the United Nations Organization, our greatest hope for peace. We must try to find some friendly basis for dealing with Russia, to clear up if possible all present differences and misunderstandings with her, in a manner consistent with our own national honor and security. I much prefer a peace conference to a war council.

Second. And while we strive to stop the march of communism throughout the world we must take prompt and effective measures to end the threat of communism right here in our own country. Communists endanger our national safety, they act as spies, they seek to create disorder, confusion, and unrest; they are enemies in our midst, and strong measures should be taken immediately to corner them, expose them, and suppress them. I hope the Committee on Un-American Activities will soon report the bill they are preparing on this subject.

Then there is one thing we must not do. That is, we must not get hysterical. While we prepare our defenses with all possible dispatch we must proceed in that calm, deliberate, and determined manner consistent with the dangers we are facing. We do not intend to pick a fight but we do intend to get ready to meet any emergency which arises and try to bring this troubled world back to the ways and blessings of peace and understanding.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a consent request? Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that give everybody 5 minutes?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. BROOKS. Then I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask, is there any opposition to this amendment?

Mr. TABER. Not as far as I know.

Mr. RANKIN. I will be willing then to forego my time to speed it up if there is no opposition to it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that there is universal agreement, at least overwhelming agreement, on the adoption of the pending amendment. If we could expedite this matter we would like to.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I suggest to the gentleman that all Members be given the privilege to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that debate close in 20 minutes?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to have 3 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am a bit disturbed by the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri in which he attempts to point out that the majority side of the House has reduced the appropriation request of the Air Force by \$100,000,000. Of course, that is wholly untrue. The majority side in agreement with the minority has actually offered an amendment to increase the appropriation over that which was requested by the President in the amount of \$822,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman knows that the testimony given by the Department and the latest statement by the Department is that \$922,000,000 is the minimum amount for which the program can be financed.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is correct in the fact that the testimony so stated, but the Bureau of the Budget requested and the request of the National Defense Department called for \$865,000,000.

Mr. CANNON. The Bureau of the Budget, of course, was governed by the limitations set by the announcement made in the House committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Was governed by what?

Mr. CANNON. There has been criticism all along that the Bureau of the Budget has sent up small estimates. These curtailed estimates have been in response to announcements made by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations at the beginning of the last two sessions of Congress that the committee would cut the budget from six to seven and a half billion dollars a year. The estimates had to be pared in accordance with those limitations. The Committee on Appropriations is responsible for the lack of adequate funds in this bill. The House now proposes to remedy it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further on this subject. I merely state that the Department estimate sent up here was for \$865,000,000 in contract authorizations. It is quite true that the Department of the Air Force testified it would take an additional \$922,000,000 to carry out the initial phases of the 70-group program. The \$822,000,000 presented now by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in his amendment I believe will give an excellent start for a program which must be carried over a number of years in order to completely modernize the Air Force.

My reason for not presenting an amendment which I had placed on the Clerk's desk to make it \$922,000,000 is because of the language which the committee has agreed to and which will be presented as an amendment toward the close of this bill, providing for a renegotiation. In that case I think we are safe in going along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York; therefore, speaking for myself and I believe for most of the members of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, I will not contest the amendment and hope it will be agreed to. However, I do not like to hear people say around here, after they make an agreement, as the gentleman from Missouri has admitted, that it is insufficient.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, after the agreement was made yesterday it was denied here on the floor.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; it was not made yesterday. According to my understanding it was made this morning, and I am willing to go along, and I trust the gentleman from Missouri will do likewise, because he has agreed to it as well.

Mr. CANNON. On the contrary, the agreement was made yesterday and announced on the floor here in the exact terms of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I have had no understanding this morning with anybody about anything. If anybody has had any agreement with me this morning let him stand up and say so. I am going along with the bob-tailed amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, but it is \$100,000,000 short of adequate national defense, as evidenced by the following letter just re-

ceived this morning from Secretary Symington, who is better qualified to judge the components of air power qualified to withstand Russian assaults than anybody else.

APRIL 15, 1948.

HON. JOHN TABER,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: Thank you for the courtesy of our discussion last evening. After leaving you I got our people together. We went over the program again in detail, and are convinced that an addition of \$922,000,000 is essential to the minimum 70-group program.

Kindly note that under this program the total annual number of planes to be purchased in the fiscal year 1950 is just a little more than one-fifth of the monthly peak during the war.

May I again bring up that if we place this business now we will improve our chance of having an adequate air force by the time the Russians have the bomb; and I want to pledge to you in the name of the Air Force and me personally that every effort will be made to purchase these planes to the very best interest of the Government and the taxpayer.

Sincerely yours,
W. STUART SYMINGTON.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I recognize this, that when we came in this morning some kind of an agreement had been made behind closed doors which would cut the Air Force by \$100,000,000 so as to prevent the Air Force from having a full 70-group program. I think the agreement is nothing short of tragic to the country and to the world. For several days the Armed Services Committee has been holding hearings on the size and strength of the armed forces, and we had estimates from all of the higher authorities of this Government upon whom we rely for the proper defense and protection and safety of the Government as to what we should have in the way of an air force. Every representative of the Air Force has testified that we should have a 70-group program. This amendment will reduce the amount that they all estimate it will cost by \$100,000,000. I think that this Congress ought to go the whole length and give the country the type of protection it needs from the air. We read everyday about the increasing importance of air power. It is the one arm of our defense that is mobile, that can be moved to all parts of the world to protect the interests of the United States and preserve the integrity of this Government and our people. It is the part of our national defense which I think in this crisis has been most sadly neglected, and I think today we should back up the full amount necessary to give the Nation a 70-group air force. I hope that we can put \$100,000,000 back into this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I want to commend the gentleman from New

York, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for having offered this amendment. As you know, I have been speaking for several days now in support of the 70-group program. Other Members have been doing likewise. I want to remind the membership that we have not been talking about the amount of money during any part of this time; we have been talking about 70 groups. The amount of money provided here certainly is not niggardly. The \$1,687,000,000 contract authorization contained under the proposed amendment is a whole lot of money. Added to that is \$608,100,000 in cash. I have given this question as much study as any member of the Committee on the Armed Services. A number of us have worked together in connection with it, and I can assure you that with this amount of money we do get 70 groups. We have won our fight for 70 groups. We may not get them as fully equipped as we would have preferred to have them with \$922,000,000 additional, but we do get them started. We do get them organized. We have accomplished what we set out to do, secure 70 groups. We have accomplished what the Finletter Commission recommended and what the Congressional Aviation Policy Board recommended, and what we have always wanted to get. So I hope there will be no dissent from the amendment, and that it will be adopted without opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time more to ask the chairman of the committee a question than anything else, although I do want to say that I wholeheartedly support the amendment now presented to us for an additional contract authorization of \$822,000,000. I am confident that with the contract renegotiation amendment that will be offered, \$822,000,000 will give us the program that was envisioned earlier with \$922,000,000.

My question is this. Has the Committee on Appropriations had an opportunity to give any thought or study to the effect this accelerated program will have in the year ahead of us on such matters as priorities, getting material, the effect on other industries, and the whole question of controls as they are involved in a speeding-up program of this kind?

Mr. TABER. We have not been able to go into that in detail. We were told by the Secretary of Defense that we could go through what was originally offered, in his opinion, without the extension of priorities or controls beyond what has been done. It is possible that we will have to do something with this additional amount. On the other hand, I believe that pressure upon the industries will result in the adoption of this program without further controls.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD].

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. On March 24, 1948, I introduced the following bill calling for a 70-group air force:

H. R. 5991

A bill to provide for an Air Force capable of preserving and maintaining peace, the security of the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that the United States shall have and maintain an air force fully capable of preserving at all times the security of the United States.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Air Force is hereby authorized and directed to immediately bring the Air Force to a force-in-being capable of instantaneous and effective action in the defense of the United States whenever and wherever necessary, the minimum requirements for which are hereby prescribed as follows:

(a) A Regular Establishment organized into not less than 70 combat groups and 22 special squadrons.

(b) An Air National Guard organized into not less than 27 groups.

(c) An Air Reserve organized into not less than 34 groups.

(d) The required number of modern types of aircraft to equip the Air Force groups described above.

(e) Facilities sufficient to support the Air Force wherever necessary.

(f) Sufficient personnel to adequately maintain and operate the Air Force and proper and adequate facilities to fully train such personnel.

(g) An orderly aircraft replacement program.

(h) A progressive program of research and development in all fields of aerial warfare and the maintenance of an adequate organization and facilities for that purpose.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force to accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "Air Security Act of 1948."

I have no pride in authorship, my only interest being in the adequate defense of this country. However, I appreciate the fact that since this bill was introduced our distinguished leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, Speaker JOE MARTIN, and outstanding leaders in both parties have seen fit to take the floor in interest of this legislation. I especially appreciate the fact that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who is known throughout the country as a very conservative Member of this House, has today offered an amendment to appropriate sufficient funds to make a 70-group air force possible. The fact that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has submitted this amendment, which appears to have the support of practically the entire membership of the House, is an indication to the entire country that this is one of the greatest steps that can be taken at this time to secure the peace and protect the interests of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this is a momentous day in

the history of this Nation. It is certainly the most significant step that has been taken by this Congress since VJ-day with respect to our military preparedness. It is further a significant day in that the House of Representatives, upon its own volition and without a request from any agency of the Government, is taking this action in expanding and modernizing our Air Force. By our action we are taking a far-reaching step in the direction of national security and world peace.

This is not so much a matter of money as it is a matter of policy. Let it be written in the record today that if we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York we are committed to a 70-group air program, which not only means the money provided in this bill, but will mean additional money in succeeding years to provide the necessary implementation for the 70-group program.

Legislation is a matter of compromise. Like many others, I am not fully satisfied with the bill before us. In my remarks on yesterday I made my position clear. I read to the House an amendment which I have drawn and placed on the Clerk's desk and which would provide for additional funds for the program. But in view of developments of today and all the circumstances I believe that it is in the public interest for us to take the joint action which has been agreed upon after a give-and-take conference on the subject.

The action which we are taking will mean a vastly improved air force and that is what we are striving for.

There are other component parts to our military force, but air power must not be neglected. It is being irrevocably decided today that air power will not be neglected in this country. I think the House and the country deserve to be congratulated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to say that the Committee on Appropriations is to be highly complimented for bringing this portion of the regular appropriation bill in in advance of the regular time in order that the program may be expedited from 4 to 6 months.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. It is indeed a very unusual thing that is being done by the House today. We are prompted to do it in view of world conditions and the desire of the House to promote the national interest.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I wish also to say that, along with the 70-group air force, the Committee on Armed Services has during the past few days had under consideration the necessity of balancing our other military organizations. Steps must be taken by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which I understand are now under consideration, to bring these other organizations up to what we call a balanced military organization.

Secretary of Defense James Forrestal had a good deal to say in regard to a bal-

anced military force when he appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services a few days ago. His statement was as follows:

We need a strong Air Force capable of striking sustained blows far beyond the peripheral bases which we now hold; an Air Force capable of the air defense of our homeland and our protective bases and capable of seeking out and destroying an enemy that might impose war. Such an Air Force requires more aircraft and more manpower than we have today in readiness to meet the war of tomorrow. In order to speed up the work of providing such an Air Force, we have requested the House Appropriations Committee to make very substantial amounts of money immediately available for aircraft procurement, and in this proposal we have had the prompt and whole-hearted cooperation of Chairman TABER and his committee.

We need a ground force to protect our air bases from hostile attack, which it takes much more than airplanes to resist. We need a ground force to seize and hold distant bases—should the attack fall upon us—in order to take the war to the enemy. Such bases, as well as our great cities here at home and our key production centers, require anti-aircraft protection, which is provided by the Army. And a strengthened Air Force will require enlargement of those Army elements which service and support its operations.

We need a Navy capable of defending the necessary sea lanes of the world from submarine attack, of developing antisubmarine warfare, of insuring the sea transportation of our manpower and our logistical supplies and equipment to distant points, and of assisting both attack and defense through air-sea power and amphibious operations.

In other words, our action in the event of any future enemy assault upon us will employ all members of the combat team—the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—a combat team made up of properly proportioned elements from each service, all in readiness to accomplish assigned objectives.

This is the concept of a balanced force to which I have referred on a number of occasions. Obviously, the word "balance" does not mean that there shall be man-for-man, an equal sized Army, Navy, and Air Force. Balance means that all three services shall be maintained at such size as will best enable them to assist one another, in the accomplishment of their assigned objectives—and this balance rests, in turn, on the strategic plans which the National Security Act directs the Joint Chiefs of Staff to prepare.

Because of this statutory function of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—and because of the fact that military strategy is both logically and legally a matter for our top military leaders—I shall continue to rely heavily on any recommendations the Joint Chiefs of Staff may make, with regard to the proper composition of a balanced force.

To meet the needs which I have just been describing, we require more manpower than we have today. The comfortable assurance of a push-button war is an illusion.

I think the Members of the House ought to know today, however, what we are facing not only from the standpoint of our national and international emergency conditions but also perhaps the cost of a balanced scheme with the so-called 70-Air Force group. Under the appropriations and expenditures for the present fiscal year, and I may say that I received these figures from the Office of the Secretary of Defense yesterday, the outlay for all the military organizations this year will be approximately \$10,500,000,000. If we adopt the so-called 70-air group program and balance it up with the needs of the other departments of the military such as the

War Department, the Navy Department, and the Marine Corps, the cost next year in expenditures and contract authorizations will be approximately \$19,300,000,000; in 1950 the cost will be \$21,600,000,000, and the cost in 1951 will be \$22,500,000,000.

Before the Congress grasps at any one quick and popular solution to the difficult problem of providing for our defense, consideration should be given to the effect of specifying the ultimate strength of one particular arm or service on the other forces. Then there is the total cost to the Nation to be considered. Estimated figures for the years 1948 to 1951 for the Army, Navy, and Air Force are in the neighborhood of:

[In billions of dollars]

	1948	1949	1950	1951
Army.....	6,400	6,280	7,200	7,200
Air Force.....	4,100	5,442	6,500	7,300
Navy.....	4,100	7,580	7,900	7,900
Total.....	10,500	19,302	21,600	22,500
Cash.....	-----	15,000	19,000	21,500
Contract authorized.....	-----	4,302	2,600	1,000

Personnel strength to provide balance for 70-group program

Army.....	837,000
Navy.....	556,000
Marines.....	108,000
Air Force, 70 groups.....	502,000

The effect on our national economy of such costs are not difficult to foresee.

Whether or not such a program effectively provides for the balanced forces required in military teamwork is easily foreseeable. Too many ships with few ground forces would be as ineffective as too many planes without enough ships to move the heavy material to points where the planes require and use that material.

Let us look to the source of these recommendations. On the one hand there is the proposal that 70 air groups would serve our national security. On the other is the recommendation of the Secretary of National Defense that on present estimates 55 groups are required in the balance with other components of national defense. It would not be wise for us to seize on the figure of 70 air groups as a complete solution. That proposal is a unilateral recommendation unsupported by the Secretary of National Defense and contrary to the joint opinion of his principal military advisers acting within the scope of their primary function.

The real answer must rest on the military effectiveness of any force we provide. If lack of balance reduces military effectiveness, then we should look for balance. Recommendations on such balance are available. Let us give them the proper consideration and not trap ourselves by snatching at any one proposal advanced by enthusiastic proponents of one particular service.

Editorial comment on this very important matter which appeared in the Washington Post on April 14, 1948, and which I feel should be read by every Member of Congress, I am inserting in the RECORD:

SEVENTY-GROUP BOOBY TRAP?

The sole criterion of whether the country should undertake to build a 70-group Air

Force at this juncture is military effectiveness. That means military effectiveness now, when the lack of American military power is a critical factor in Europe, as well as effectiveness in some future day when the 70 groups are a reality. We have no doubt that, given the present state of world affairs and the premier role of air power, a 70-group Air Force is desirable. But to achieve this Air Force at the expense of other necessary and more immediate military measures, as now seems the disposition of Congress, looks to us like a very perilous tack indeed.

The Air Force's part in the present congressional reversal is thinly disguised. If Air Force leaders did not plant the suggestion that Secretary Forrestal be overruled in favor of a larger plane fleet now, at least they did not bother to conceal their pleasure at the turn events took on Capitol Hill last week. What this amounts to, it seems to us, is deliberate scuttling of the balance Mr. Forrestal was seeking to achieve. It makes interservice unification look ridiculous and demonstrates that the recent agreement at Key West was only paper deep. The victim, of course, is universal military training, which according to present reports, has been returned to the shelf.

The choice is by no means so simple as that outlined by Air Force Secretary Symington Tuesday when he said: "I think our national security would be better served by a 70-group Air Force than by a group of 18-year-old boys being called in for training." What the air power zealots have failed to point out, in their rush to grab the gravy, is that a larger Air Force requires larger land and sea forces solely for air support. Right now, for example, 30 percent of the Army overhead is devoted to support of the Air Force, and nearly 10 percent of the Army's present meager manpower is engaged in Air Force supply. According to recent testimony of Gen. Omar N. Bradley, a major combat air base, consisting of 20 air groups and 125,000 Air Force personnel, would require Army contingents numbering 375,000 merely to defend and supply it. Naval forces undoubtedly would be needed in proportion. Nor is this all. Since air bases in hostile territory do not capture themselves, both naval and land forces are required to secure them. And before bases can be obtained close to the enemy, naval air operations will have a vital role—for overseas airfields are essential to even the longest-range of the present land-based bombers.

Moreover, what is needed in the way of air strength is not mere size. It would do no good to augment the present 55 groups with planes already obsolescent. The main thing to concentrate on, it seems to us, is readiness—in other words, a greatly expanded and liberally endowed research program coupled with a preparedness effort in industry. That is the way to dynamic, rather than static, strength.

Secretary Forrestal did quite properly, we think, to warn that the failure to enact UMT would mean a draft of indefinite duration. For, aside from the support troops entailed by a larger Air Force, a paramount consideration today is more divisions to back up American and western European diplomacy where they confront aggressive communism most directly. The most economical way to insure more divisions is through a combination of the draft and UMT, and a default on UMT would make the draft that much more important. This is not an argument against augmented air power, but rather an argument against consideration of air power alone as a panacea for American security.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE to the Taber amendment: Strike out the figures "\$1,687,000,000" and insert "\$1,787,000,000."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that a few of our colleagues have entered into an agreement to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], but it is \$100,000,000 short of the requested amount that is said to be necessary for a 70-group air force. We have heard statements made by some gentlemen, including the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, that the amount in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is not sufficient. Others say that it is. If there is any doubt about it I am one who wants to make it certain that today the House of Representatives is not only willing but has beyond doubt provided adequately for a 70-group air force.

That is my purpose in offering the amendment to increase the funds for the Air Force to the full amount requested by Secretary Symington and which not only he but the House Armed Services Committee says is necessary to provide an adequate Air Force.

Approval of a 70-group air force will, perhaps more eloquently than many other things we have done and may do, serve notice not only upon the one nation that is striking fear into the hearts of people everywhere, but it will also let other nations, particularly those who may now be teetering on the brink, know unmistakably that the United States is not going to repeat the mistakes we made before World Wars I and II of remaining militarily weak and impotent, thereby giving open invitation to aggression and conquest by rampaging dictatorship.

If there is any doubt of this amount being adequate, and doubt has been raised, let us provide the full amount in contract authorization requested by the chiefs of the air force. If later peace should descend upon the world—and God grant it may—this Congress can cancel or recapture. But as of today with the alarming threat to world peace and freedom, let us not stop \$100,000,000 short of the goal of a 70-group air force.

A large air force need not and should not be considered as a substitute for adequate strength in other branches of our armed service.

I am prepared to support universal military training, with safeguards which I think proper, and limited selective service, too. So you see, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment not as an alibi for avoiding our plain duty to meet the requirements of national defense and world security in other respects. Not at all.

Although I lay no claim to being a strategist, I do believe that superiority in the air over any and all possible foes should not be made secondary to any other phase of security or compromised for any reason.

During the recent debate upon the European recovery program, I heard sev-

eral Members, both Republicans and Democrats, recall the tragic history of the indecision and weakness of free countries and the consequent appeasement of 10 years ago. When the historian chronicles that period I believe one unfortunate fact about America will stand out—we were plagued with disunity and indecision.

I shall not dwell upon the awfully tragic history of the last decade. Suffice it to say that there is good reason to believe that had the United States and the other free nations, which eventually joined together in resisting the axis undertaking to dominate the world, awakened earlier and together marshaled their strength earlier, thereby letting Hitler and his Axis partners know unmistakably that aggression would be resisted, World War II might never have happened. Perhaps it might not be amiss to recall, too, that the Kaiser, as did Hitler, started World War I in the belief that the United States would not or could not come to the aid of freedom before he could accomplish his diabolical ambitions. The Kaiser and Hitler and his partners were wrong, but, by leaving them in doubt as to what the United States would do, two world wars had to be fought with all their calamities and suffering.

Perhaps my colleagues have been as disillusioned as I have been that so soon after a complete victory another aggression threatens freedom. Recalling the acclaim given former Secretary Hull's successful conference in Moscow and the contemporary public approval given President Roosevelt's negotiations at Yalta and Tehran, I believe it is fair to say that the American people sincerely believed that the United States and Russia could work together amicably for world peace and that America's desire to do so was not only sincere but overwhelming. As a nation, we tried; we tried hard, too hard. The late President Roosevelt and President Truman are both now subjected to criticism for trying too hard to get along with Russia. Perhaps the real fault to be found with the agreements our leaders made with Russia in those conferences is not so much that our concessions and compromises were too great in quest of peace, but that we trusted too implicitly. Had Russia sincerely entered and kept the agreements reached with her in the same spirit of cooperation and peaceful intent with which America was imbued, who can say that the agreements would not now be acclaimed as milestones of cooperation and mutual self-respect by two great nations in their progress toward world peace and stability.

I am not one of those who contend that the record of the United States has always been spotless and blameless. Perhaps some of our citizens, perhaps some of our military, perhaps some of our officials have in some ways contributed to the mutual suspicion and distrust that characterizes the struggle between the United States and her allies on the one hand and Russia and her satellites on the other. But I resent, bitterly resent, the apologists for Russia and the American fronts for communism who find no

fault with Russia and charge the United States with imperialism and place upon her the blame for world strife.

One nation and one nation alone has persistently ignored and violated agreements reached by the Allies at Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam.

One nation alone has obstructed the United Nations by the constant abuse of the veto.

One nation and one nation alone has destroyed the independence and democratic character of a whole series of nations in eastern and central Europe.

One nation and one nation alone is violently undertaking to defeat the mutual efforts of the remaining 16 free western European nations, with the aid of the United States, to bring about economic recovery and political stability to their war devastated economies and peoples.

That nation is our so-recent ally, Russia.

The actions of this nation have thrown fear of war and concern for freedom into the hearts of men everywhere. I do not regard war as imminent and hope and pray that it is not, but we must not be blinded to the fact that the aggression of Russia creates conditions which, when allowed to go unchecked in the past, have invariably led to war.

It is a significant world fact that only the United States has the power and influence to give effective world leadership against the onrushing scourge of despotic communism. Either we lead the great majority of nations on the road to recovery, prosperity, and peace for them and for us or we abandon them to strangulation and our own inevitable involvement in the resulting chaos.

As a nation we have come to international maturity by painful and costly processes, but make no mistake about it, one of the dramatic facts of the world today is that America as a Nation is maturing diplomatically and politically under the strain of her responsibilities of world leadership, is, as is characteristic of her individual citizens, rising to the exigencies of a crisis.

This is illustrated by the bipartisan development and support of the gigantic European recovery program, popularly referred to as the Marshall plan. There has never been any peacetime undertaking by this or any other Nation comparable to this in size and scope or generosity. Not only is the \$6,000,000,000 expenditure for the next year unexampled but so is the long-term nature of the undertaking. Even more epochal is the unanimity with which our people and our Government have come to this affirmative resolution and policy.

Passage of the European recovery program, however, is only one of the necessary steps we must take. Russia cannot be bluffed; unless we have the power and force to back our words with actions there is no way either to convince Russia to the contrary or apparently to even command her respect for our position. We must mobilize our strength, first to give the necessary protection to our own country and her interests, and second, and perhaps even more important right now, to let the world pointedly, including Russia, know

that America is convinced that world peace is not secure anywhere unless it is secure everywhere; that we cherish peace and freedom and are determined to do our utmost to preserve it.

I do hope you will approve the amendment I have offered. We have already passed the European recovery program which I think is a vital part of our great gamble for peace. Let us today set in motion a program that will leave us second to none in the air, another vital and necessary step, and, next, let us proceed to raise our Army and Navy to the required level of strength, push scientific development and train our manpower.

Peace cannot be had merely by wishing for it. The price of peace and security is high and it will remain so until every potential dictator in the world is made to know that civilized mankind can and will rise up in its organized wrath and might and smite down whoever attempts by force to desecrate the dignity of man and subjugate the world to a despotic will.

The magnitude and character of our danger requires that our course of action be as cautious as it is resolute and strong. As I see it, we are engaged in a long, drawn-out struggle with a powerful nation led by an ambitious and dictatorial political clique who neither honor nor observe any scruples but are actuated by a godless, materialistic ideology. Perhaps the program does not differ greatly from the historic expansionist policy of Russia under the Czars, but it appears more powerful than ever before, better organized and, therefore, more menacing.

The staying power of democracy may be sorely put to test. I firmly believe that our best hope of peace lies in bold, audacious use of our unparalleled power and influence. Failure to act is to default not only our opportunity but our responsibility.

To face this long-term crisis, I want to emphasize the necessity for America and Americans to exercise discriminating judgment. We must avoid the peaks of optimism and valleys of pessimism as the Communist tide alternately surges and recedes in the years ahead. Let us resist the tendency to follow the optimist who, encouraged by a temporary lessening of Russian pressure, says that the time of danger has passed, and avoid, too, the fatalist who says, "War is inevitable. Let us drop the bomb."

Too, we must assiduously guard against becoming so bellicose and militaristic or so filled with hate and distrust that we lose the flexibility and imagination necessary to win through. Nor must we become discouraged because the goal is not easily reached or remains afar. This must be true not just of the politicians but of the people. If it is true of the people it will be true of the politicians. In other words, the test of democracy's staying power will be found in the degree in which our policies are rooted in public understanding and sustained public sentiment. Let us never forget that neither the President nor the Congress nor both can for very long lead where the people will not follow.

When we are tempted to unburden ourselves of the frightful responsibilities that are ours whether we like it or not, let us remember that one conclusion looms up inescapably; we cannot alone have peace and prosperity.

If the cost seems high, as it will, let us ask ourselves if anything really good ever comes without sacrifice. Life itself comes only after pain and travail.

If the struggle appears long and hard, or even threatens to become cataclysmic, just remember that the stakes are high. Peace and freedom are involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. GOFF].

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that this is an amendment to the amendment submitted by the committee?

Mr. GORE. It is.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the original amendment submitted by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and in opposition to the amendment to the amendment.

I think the additional amount that has been put into this bill by the committee is entirely satisfactory to those of us who have persistently favored an increase in our Air Force, and who feel that the chief reliance of this country should be on the air arm to preserve peace and for its defense, if attacked. I think this is a momentous step which the committee is taking. I feel it commits the Congress to the theory that machines, not men, will win the next war if it comes. It looks to the future and not to the past.

I am satisfied with the amendment as originally submitted, and I hope that the amendment to the amendment will be defeated as it is just petty politics.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this is really a historic day in the life of this country.

We have come to the turning point, when it comes to protecting America against her enemies at home and abroad. This bill, with the proposed amendment, is a long step in the right direction.

I cannot tell you what occurred in the executive session of the Committee on Un-American Activities this morning, but when the legislation agreed upon comes to the floor of the House, you will see a measure that goes further toward protecting American institutions against the enemies within our gates, than anything else that has yet been proposed.

This movement to increase our Air Force is to me the most encouraging step that has yet been taken on this floor. We have reached the time when our Air Force is our first line of defense. The next war will be an atomic conflict. It will be fought with airplanes and atomic bombs. It may mark the end of our civilization. I shall vote for the top amount offered here. If that fails, I shall support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The safety of all the American people is at stake. We cannot afford to take any chances of having our country blown to pieces for want of an adequate Air Force to protect us.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman knows that the Armed Services Committee unanimously voted for the full amount necessary for a 70-group air force.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not know that. I will say to the gentleman from Louisiana that he does not offend me when he comes out for the top amount proposed by the amendment, because I realize that if we are going to save America, if we are going to save American institutions, we are not only going to have to have the strongest air force on earth, but we are going to have to clean house and fumigate at home.

Let us put the safety of our country above all other considerations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, for 4 months I and other members of the committee have been working on the aviation problem presently confronting you in this House today. We are properly doing something which will result in the United States having the best air force in the world. I agree with my colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that we must give the Air Force our utmost support. I go along with him on his statements regarding the late Billy Mitchell. We cannot, however, write appropriation bills on the floor of the House every time an appropriation bill comes up here without well-conducted hearings and justifications. Those who are responsible for building and organizing and forming our air forces have come before us and told us what they wanted and needed in this deficiency bill. We gave them every penny asked. They did not want anything more at this particular time. They are the ones who will have the responsibility to build this Air Force, not we on the floor of the House.

The chairman of the committee the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] asked Secretary Forrestal if he wanted anything more than was asked in their deficiency bill. Here is what Secretary Forrestal said to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]:

It is all that I can support at this particular time until I can evaluate the studies now under way.

In spite of this statement the chairman the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] offers an amendment to increase this figure by more than \$800,000,000 because he and the rest of us feel we must start a 70-group air force. I will support the chairman's amendment because it follows the recommendations of the congressional air policy board of which I am a member. The figure is well thought out and was pretty well agreed to by many Members on both sides of the aisle. It is a figure which comes to us from a distinguished chairman of the

Appropriations Committee, who with his colleagues, has held long and detailed hearings on all phases of our aviation needs. The information which we have accumulated was both off and on the record and the amendment is well justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] for 2 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the other day we voted to send \$5,000,000,000 overseas to feed the people of Europe. We did it as an auxiliary part of our national defense efforts. But the action that we will take today will mean more to our national security than 40 Marshall plans. You cannot fight Russia or any other country that fights you with guns, unless you have weapons that are more deadly than theirs; nor can you fight them with food alone. By the same token, we cannot afford to fight world war III with the weapons of World Wars I and II. I am going to support the substitute amendment providing the additional \$100,000,000 because I do not believe in gambling with our national security by cutting funds for the weapon that is eventually going to save our own necks—our United States Air Force.

Seventy groups has been held by our aviation experts to be the absolute minimum required for peacetime operations. I do not believe that anyone can conscientiously deny that we would be gambling with our security to allow our air arm to remain below this level; particularly in view of the grave international crisis existing today.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If it should fail, which I trust it will not, then I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

With few exceptions we agree that the strengthening of our defense would be an act of peace and not of war. With no exceptions we agree that a strong air force constitutes the front line of our defense. So today we are rightly putting first things first, that is, the establishment of the strongest air force in the world.

I am delighted that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has seen fit to offer his amendment. He yields to no one in conserving the dollars of the American taxpayer. The mere fact that he, conservative as he is, has seen fit to offer an amendment increasing this item by \$822,000,000 should be sufficient warning of the need that every Member of the House should support his effort. On the other hand, I for one am willing to go even further. Would it not be better that we take no chances at all? I judge from the debate that doubt does exist in the minds of some as to whether or not the Taber amendment goes far enough. It occurs to me that this is a matter on which we should not take the slightest chance. It was only a few years ago that we came up with too little too late. All along the way before Pearl Harbor the doubt was being resolved in the favor of economy or

of something else with regard to our defense program. Action was based on the hope that the worst would not come. But it came. And the loss of American lives was terrific, to say nothing of our tax dollars.

Certainly we have by this time learned our lesson. So long as a doubt exists, so long as there are strong differences of opinion as to the need, so long as an additional amount of only \$100,000,000 is involved, why shouldn't we resolve the doubt in favor of defense and not economy, and support the Gore amendment? It could prove to be good economy. After all is said, if the additional amount is not needed, the Congress can step in and recapture the unexpended balance.

What does this amount to when compared with the billions our country is pouring into Europe and the rest of the world? This, Mr. Chairman, is no time for taking chances or penny pinching.

I resolve the doubt in favor of a strong air force, a strong defense. I shall support the Gore amendment with the hope that you will do likewise. If it should fail then I shall support the Taber amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for 2 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the most important thing before the House right now is not a dollar sign; it is unity. It is unity on the proposition that we are going to have a modern 70-group air force.

When the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, asked Secretary Forrestal to come before us with an idea of canvassing the aircraft picture, we had no budget estimates calling for a 70-group program or anything of that sort. We only had a supplemental estimate from the President through the Bureau of the Budget for \$725,000,000.

As a result of a conference between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and Mr. Forrestal, it appeared that considerable time could be saved in procurement if enough funds were appropriated and contract authorization established to put into the letting stage the aircraft procurement portions of the estimates before the Army and Navy subcommittees as well as the President's supplemental estimate. It was agreed that would be done, and that was done in the bill as it was reported to the House. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Forrestal, was highly pleased and so expressed himself as the portion of his testimony cited in the report clearly shows. The amounts were \$608,000,000 in cash and \$865,000,000 in contract authorizations.

This proposal of the committee, growing out of the initiative and foresight of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] far exceeded the expectations of the defense establishment when the President's supplemental request was submitted. The members of the committee canceled other plans to give their full time to work on this matter Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of last week and Monday, and reported the bill to the full committee Tuesday.

In the meantime, sentiment had been developing both in Congress and in the country for moving into the complete 70-group Air Force program proposed in the so-called Finletter committee's report and that of the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board, of which the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is vice chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] are members, and the gentleman from Massachusetts and myself are advisory members on our respective committees.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Deficiencies was cognizant of this sentiment in the country and in the Congress. So, yesterday, in a series of informal conferences between the chairman and various Members interested in this matter, including the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], an effort was made to agree upon a further addition to the authorizations for the Air Force which would definitely and indisputably say, "We are going to have a modern 70-group Air Force."

And that is what is proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, to increase the contract authorizations from \$865,000,000 to \$1,687,000,000, a further increase over the official request of Secretary Forrestal and the Bureau of the Budget by \$822,000,000—to give us a 70-group Air Force in modern planes.

True, it had been estimated by the Air Force itself that \$922,000,000 additional was the figure they would like to have for such a purpose. It was not a figure passed upon by the Bureau of the Budget. It was the asking figure of the Air Force. During our hearings we had asked the procurement people if the price did not go down with larger volume. They assured us that it did, and cited lowering of average per pound figures for aircraft when larger orders were placed or when assurance of a steady flow of orders could be given.

So last night we asked Mr. Symington if we took the 70-group program in one bite instead of two would there not be some economies? He said that in his offhand opinion there could be saved somewhere between \$50,000,000 and \$100,000,000. And upon that basis an agreement was reached within the committee that an amendment would be offered on that basis, and it has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The amendment is before you. Unity and good faith are at stake as well as other things. There ought to be only one answer on the part of the membership here today.

If I were going to do any advertising of a situation before the world which involves security and national defense, I would not advertise weakness, I would advertise strength. And I would advertise unity.

Mr. Chairman, there are many legislative steps taken in the name of national defense. There are many taken in the name of stopping Stalin from engulfing the free nations of the world, many steps taken in the name of stopping communism. Some of those measures, in the opinion of some people have been of uncertain results. Some proposals seem to

suggest an invitation to communism to move in—to "Come and get it. The picking's fine." But Mr. Chairman, while opinions might differ on some measures, there can hardly be any difference on this matter now before us.

This is not a bill which now says to Joe Stalin or anybody else: "Come and get it." This is a bill which with the increase provided by the Taber amendment will say to Stalinism or communism or any other man or system that seeks to infringe upon the liberties of the free people of the world: "Stop, look, and listen."

This says to all the world: "We are proposing to defend freedom by building a 70-group air force, thoroughly modernized, just as rapidly as procurement can be obtained."

And it is my earnest hope that by this evidence of determination and strength, that the very need of ever using the force in combat will itself vanish and that reason and justice may prevail in the relations of the nations of the world.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I strongly favor the amendment to increase the supplemental estimates of \$922,000,000 for aircraft production for the Air Forces, Navy, and Marine Corps. Looking at the matter from a long-range point of view I doubt if even that amount, plus next year's budget estimates, will do what the country expects to be done in the way of aircraft procurement.

It should be pointed out though that the total budget estimates for this purpose for the present fiscal year are \$3,298,100,000 if this amendment is adopted. Unquestionably, that is a tremendous sum. However, it should be recalled that this sum is only a small part of the cost of our Air Force procurement when the Air Corps was operating so effectively against Germany. The whole point under discussion boils itself down simply to this: We must start building a tremendous Air Force now. The longer we wait the more trouble we invite from communistic Russia. We cannot pick up a Sears, Roebuck catalog and order these airplanes. From the time the plans are on the drawing board until the planes begin to roll off the assembly lines will require at a minimum about 18 months.

We can never hope to reach perfection in the design of planes, because through scientific investigation and research constant improvement is being made. If we delay our construction program until we think we have the best design of planes on earth, we shall wake up and find ourselves in the same position as we did in 1940 and 1941—namely, without them.

Let us go to work now and work feverishly to prepare. Later we can appropriate more money, which we will unquestionably have to do in order to carry out the wishes and the will of the American people. Frankly, I am convinced that in its thinking on rearmament for peace the American people are at least 12 months ahead of the Republican-

dominated Congress and a good many of our leaders of national defense. We should adopt this amendment increasing these funds without further delay.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

OUR NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIRES A STRONG AIR FORCE

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the United States should have and maintain the strongest air force in the world. As the situation now stands, we are lagging considerably behind Soviet Russia in air power. We have a chance here today to do something about it.

The appropriations bill that is now being debated carries contract authorization for \$865,000,000 for new aircraft construction. There are amendments pending on the clerk's desk increasing that figure by \$922,000,000, making the total figure \$1,787,000,000. I rise in support of that increase just presented by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

SEVENTY GROUP COMBAT UNITS NEEDED

Mr. Chairman, this proposed increase would provide funds to bring our Air Force program up to 70 group combat units. There can be no serious opposition to that goal. We were told on yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the ranking Democrat on the Appropriations Committee which reported this bill, that the \$865,000,000 is not sufficient even for the 55-group program. He went on to say that as a matter of fact this appropriation is not sufficient to maintain the present strength of the Air Corps.

It is obvious, therefore, that the bill as now drawn is wholly inadequate if we are to maintain even a fairly strong air force.

Now what can we expect if the 70-group program is adopted? The procurement requirement for such a program is not a secret. Our Air Force officials tell us that for the 70-group force we need at least 6,869 aircraft, 3,212 for the National Guard, 2,360 for the Air Reserve—comprising a total of at least 12,441 airplanes. Then, a strategic reserve of 8,100 brings this over-all total to 20,541 aircraft.

What do we have today? We have in active service about 10,000 aircraft, mostly trainers. Today, we have only around 500 bombers and 2,000 fighting planes in service, and many of these are obsolescent.

We are told further, Mr. Chairman, that our annual procurement requirement to keep our Air Force up and keep it modern requires 5,200 airplanes annually. It must be kept in mind that the 70-group plan is a minimum to meet our present defense needs. To be effective every unit must, of course, be fully trained and equipped.

Moreover, for the 70-group program to be effective, it must be supported by civilian reserve components, well trained and equipped. These reserves must be able to leave their civilian jobs, if need

be, and step into the cockpits of our modern bombers.

At present the National Air Guard and the Air Reserve program are enabled to train but a small portion of available personnel, and much of this training is being done in obsolete airplanes.

BEST AUTHORITIES FAVOR 70-GROUP PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, there is much agreement in high places for the imperative need for this 70-group program. General Eisenhower has advocated it. General Spaatz, Chief of the Army Air Forces, has advocated it. Former Deputy Chief of the Air Forces, Lt. Gen. Ira Eaker, has been a long-time advocate of a program of this kind. Air Secretary Stuart Symington supports it vigorously.

It will be remembered that last year the President appointed a five-man Air Policy Commission to evaluate the course the Nation should take in order to obtain "the greatest possible benefits from aviation." The chairman of that Commission was Hon. Thomas K. Finletter. The Commission of known experts recommended a 70-group combat air force as a minimum requirement because "world peace and the security of the United States are now the same thing."

The report, in recommending the pressing need for a stronger air force for our national security made the solemn warning that "even the most optimistic view of the United Nations" does not assure us "that this world organization will develop in time the necessary authority to prevent another great war."

The report proposes that we start immediately on this increase and that by 1952 besides the 70 groups with the 6,869 first-line aircraft, an Air National Guard of 27 groups with 3,212 first-line aircraft, and an adequately equipped 34-group Air Reserve, be provided.

In addition to all this very convincing evidence for the 70-group program, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board and the Armed Services Committee of the House have strongly recommended this increase for our Air Forces.

TIME IS VITAL FACTOR IN PLANNING AND BUILDING PLANES

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude, I want to talk about time for a moment. It has often been said that in a naval building program we could never have a Navy of any value in wartime if it were not planned at least 3 to 5 years beforehand. That is because it takes from 3 to 5 years to build a warship after construction is begun. The same can very nearly be said of planning for the Air Forces.

Germany began bombing England in 1940 and it was not until 1943 that Britain and the United States were able to successfully bomb Germany in the daytime. It took 3 years to get ready to retaliate.

It takes from 5 to 7 years to plan and produce a new airplane. All the planes that were used in the last war were on the drawing boards before the outbreak of hostilities. Time is indeed a precious thing in the aircraft industry. Consider for a moment our famous B-29's. The preliminary designs for those bombers were made in 1938 and 1939 and our Air Forces first contracted for them in 1940.

And even with a priority that was second only to the atomic bomb project, it was four more years before the first bombs were dropped on Japan by our great B-29's.

BEFORE PEARL HARBOR ISOLATIONISTS AND APPEASERS OPPOSED PREPAREDNESS

So this aircraft development program is a continuous thing. It calls for vision, for farsightedness. We cannot afford to be caught short again. Only 10 years ago there were men in this Congress who were so completely devoid of vision that they voted against the two-ocean naval expansion bill of 1938. It is fortunate for our Nation that despite the shortsightedness of this minority the bill was passed and resulted in the building of most of the ships that were instrumental in our victories against Germany and Japan. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] was the author of that naval and air force expansion bill in 1938. He spoke on this floor yesterday in support of the 70-group air force and his advice of yesterday was quite similar to his advice of 10 years ago when he was pleading with the appeasers and isolationists to vote for a two-ocean Navy and a stronger Air Force to go with it.

It has been charged that this increase in the Air Force will result in the Navy being neglected. That should not and in my judgment will not happen. All the experts agree that the three branches—Army, Navy, and Air Force—are interdependent upon each other.

Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, retired, who is the greatest authority in this country, and perhaps in any country, on the role of the Navy in modern warfare, recently wrote me a letter in which he strongly defended the part of the Navy in our future scheme of national security.

It is my conviction—

The admiral wrote—

that the battleship is not obsolete, nor is the time foreseeable now when such ships may be discarded as one of the most important parts of the sea defense of the United States.

Admiral Nimitz went on to say that if it had not been for the battleships such as were built under the Naval Expansion Act of 1938 "we could not have won the war."

This distinguished expert on naval warfare pointed out that land invasions may be necessary in the future in order to strike at the source of the enemy's weapon centers.

When men and the weapons are landed in enemy territory, it is the Navy which must take them there and it is the Navy which makes it possible for such forces to land and obtain a beachhead—

He continued.

The admiral concluded by saying that while in the future the composition of fleets may change radically—

I am thoroughly convinced that whatever the new strategy, the battleship will have its irreplaceable part in tactics.

IF ANOTHER WAR OCCURS AMERICA WILL BE GIVEN NO TIME TO GET READY

Mr. Chairman, the future belongs to those who hurry. Let's not be too late

with too little next time, if another war should befall mankind. As General Eaker has so ably pointed out many times, the United States will undoubtedly be the first target if there unhappily should be another full-scale war. We must be prepared to meet such attack with devastating force.

In every war up to the present we have had allies to hold the enemy in check until we could get our production going and prepare ourselves. But we will not have that advantage in the future. No longer can we expect such good fortune.

The best way to have peace today is to be prepared for war. In one short generation we have witnessed two devastating wars. And another is now threatened. Despite our victories, despotism and tyranny still prevail in Soviet Russia and the countries she dominates. Let us arm ourselves with a strong army, navy, and air force, and continue relentlessly in the struggle for world peace. That struggle will not succeed if we are weak or if we appease. Surely history of the past decade has taught us the utter futility of appeasing a dictator.

The late Jan Masaryk, who died a martyr to the cause of human freedom recently in Czechoslovakia, who knew the Russian mind and the Russian ambition, said not long before his tragic death:

America is the only country in the world that can make Russia go slow.

He went on to give us some good advice:

If I were an American—

He said—

I'd go all out for a tough policy toward Russia. That's the only way for you to keep her in line: get tough.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

It authorizes the Secretary of the Air Force to enter into contracts for airplanes and other items required by his Department to an amount of \$822,000,000, in addition to the sum provided in the bill as it now stands before us.

Yesterday I introduced H. R. 6247, a bill which provides that the United States Air Force shall consist of 70 Regular Air Force groups, 22 separate Regular Air Force squadrons, 27 National Guard air groups and 34 Air Reserve groups and their auxiliary units. It also authorizes an active duty strength of 502,000 in the Air Force, consisting of 70,500 officers, 4,800 warrant officers, and 426,700 enlisted persons. The need for such an Air Force as our first line of defense in a future war has been stressed by our military leaders. Today, any hostile nation attempting to attack the United States must rely on airplanes, guided missiles, and aerial operations. Our Navy is now larger than all other navies in the world combined. Our Army must be increased to render effective service in the occupation and defense areas. We cannot hope to keep as many enlisted men in active service as some possible enemies but our committee has been advised that a 70 combat group Air Force, with its proper

components, can beat back any probable attack on the United States and immediately start a devastating offensive on vital enemy targets. The knowledge that we have such an Air Force will be a great deterrent to any nation which desires to attack us. One of its most important results will be the maintenance of our aviation industry on a basis which will permit quick expansion to meet war needs.

Our only possible enemy now has more jet planes than the United States and is producing military planes at a far greater rate than we are. The expense of this program is large but it will be our best insurance of peace. It will take from 3 to 5 years to put our Air Force on a sound basis in accordance with this program. Following the passage of this bill, I would expect that further legislation may be brought before Congress for action which will establish legally a 70-group air force for the United States with a personnel limit of 502,000 officers and men. I feel that this program is sound and should be carried into effect at an early date.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Air power is our first line of defense. There is no substitute to being strong. There is no middle ground.

World conditions are uncertain. There exists turmoil in Italy, violence in Colombia, trouble with Red terrorists in Austria, the Scandinavian countries, and in other parts of the world.

We can take no chances on a matter as vital as our freedom and independence. Russia is arming and has been building large quantities of planes, tanks, and submarines for many months past.

To provide for a 70-group air force will cause any would-be aggressor to take stock before attacking us. Nothing short of an air force of that size and magnitude should be provided at this time.

We will be flirting with disaster if we do less.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, while I am in favor of the provisions of the pending bill H. R. 6226, I am more in favor of the bill as amended by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and still more in favor of the amendment offered to the Taber amendment by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Our people have a well founded and justified feeling, in which I concur, that our very first line of defense is in aviation. It is shocking to know how helpless we, the richest nation on the face of the earth, seem to be as compared with Russia. I believe the passage of this measure, carrying the maximum amount that might be needed, coupled with the fact that we have the atomic bomb, will deter any present possible aggressor nation. The next war, if there be another

one and God forbid, will be largely fought in the air. Airplane development moves so swiftly until some equipment is obsolete soon after it leaves the assembly line.

The law of self-preservation makes it mandatory for us to look to our military strength without delay. I predict that this measure will pass with but few, if any, dissenting votes. The news of its passage will cause those nations who are disturbing the peace of the world to stop, look, and listen. The passage of this bill will bring comfort to the hearts of so many parents, although willing for their sons to leave home for military service are praying that such will not be necessary. I am conscious of the fact that we cannot rely solely on air defenses. Even in this fast moving age, foot soldiers are still required to prosecute a war. I am disappointed more men have not volunteered for military service, especially in view of the fact that the pay allowances and other opportunities and advantages exceed those ever dreamed of by any other nation. It is my purpose to not only vote for this bill but to vote as soon as opportunity is given for a revival of selective service. Also, I am in favor of universal military training, especially in view of present world conditions.

Let us speed up the passage of these essential measures providing for adequate military strength in all of the phases so essential for the preservation of our free way of life.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think I need take no time to remind the Members of the House that these are times that call for strong preparedness measures. Not a day passes that our public press does not report some event that emphasizes the fact. The tension over Berlin and Vienna, the open revolt in Bogota, the uncertainty over the outcome of the coming elections in Italy—these are matters to cause us to take stock of our military resources, and to ask ourselves, "Are we prepared to meet and defeat an act of aggression such as that which plunged us into war on December 7th, 1941?" Are we prepared to take such retaliatory action that the outcome of whatever struggle may ensue will never for one moment be in doubt? Can we guarantee in another war victory for the United States that in the 167 years of its existence has been forced to fight many wars but which, thank God, has not—up to now—ever suffered final defeat in any war.

An issue of prime importance before the House at this moment is the size of the United States Air Force which this Congress has established to maintain the air defense of the United States, and to conduct the air operations necessary to victory in any war that may take place in this air age of the world's history. The Secretary of the Air Force has asked for appropriations large enough to give us a 70-group air force and in the request he has been seconded by Gen. Carl Spaatz, Chief of Staff of our Air Force and distinguished air strategist whose knowledge and whose leadership contributed so notably to our victory in World War II.

Opposition to so large an air force—an air force that is only one-seventh the size

of the Air Force necessary to our victories of only 3 years ago—has been registered by the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations. The Secretary of Defense has himself requested that appropriations be made for strengthening our defenses, but it is clear from his testimony that the appropriations he has recommended will not permit a 70-group air force. That is why the Secretary of the Air Force has appealed to Congress, and—through Congress—to the American people.

Opponents of an increase of strength in our Air Force suggest that the fight for a stronger air force represents a scuttling of the balanced strength of the armed forces that the Secretary of Defense is trying to achieve. They claim that an increase in air force strength would require larger land and sea forces solely for air support. They claim that an increase in air force strength now denies the principle of unification of the armed services that was the intention of the National Security Act of 1947, and violates the Key West agreements, worked out only a few weeks ago by the several Secretaries and the Chiefs of Staff of the National Military Establishment.

In the discussions which presently occupy us we have lost sight of the fact that plans for a 70-group air force are not new, and are in fact inherent in all postwar planning for the national military establishment. Even before the victory had been won in World War II, the 70-group program for the peacetime Air Force had been evolved. The goal, accepted then, has been the objective of all Air Force planning ever since.

On November the 8th, 1945, representatives of the air force and of the War Department General Staff established the 70-group program as the basis for Air Force planning, and allocated 400,000 men out of the 1,070,000 authorized by Congress, for Air Force troop basis. In accepting this figure, the Air Force pointed out that the training and support of the Air National Guard, the Air Reserve, the Air ROTC would require an additional allocation of personnel. The Air Force also pointed out that with separation from the Army, and with the transfer of additional responsibilities from the Army, an increase in personnel would be necessary.

Since that time the Air Force has requested further allocation of personnel, but its request has been consistently refused. The Air Force now feels that 502,000 men are necessary to man a 70-group air force. The acceleration of the program, in the face of the increasingly troubled international situation, requires an increase in personnel. The achievement of autonomy for the Air Force has given it responsibility for functions, not taken into consideration under the original estimates, for which additional personnel are likewise required. But while the estimate of personnel to man the 70-group program has been revised since November 1945, the number of groups needed for a stabilized, peacetime air force has never once been revised. In asking for a 70-group air force, with their proper complements of aircraft and

of personnel, the Secretary of the Air Force has merely requested fulfillment now, instead of at some future date, of the goal established 3 years ago.

I want to speak for a moment about the reasons why we have not already attained that goal. Until March 1947—just 1 year ago—the Air Force progressed steadily toward the goal of the 70-group program. At that time notice of reduction in funds caused the Air Force to reconsider. The air staff determined that on its new financial basis the Air Force could support only 55 groups. Since the budget reduction was not accompanied by any change whatsoever in the commitments which generated the requirement for the 70-group program, it was decided that rather than abandon the program, the Air Force would proceed on the assumption that the 55 groups would represent a phase of the ultimate 70-group program. In July 1947, General Spaatz directed that all groups of the 55-group phase would be activated, organized, and in place with some degree of operating mobility by January 1, 1948. General Spaatz' order was carried out. We now have our 55 groups. No one dare say that the Air Force has ever agreed, or assumed, that there would not eventually be 15 groups more.

The Air Force has made its plans, from the time it undertook the necessary demobilization of men who had served in World War II, for a 70-group air force. Its planes were not secret. They were announced to the world. It is reasonable to assume that the Army and the Navy made plans consistent with an Air Force of the size agreed upon and sought after. The Army strength goal was set at 669,000, and remains there. The Navy has an authorized strength of 552,000 men. When the Key West agreements were reached, only a few weeks ago, in an atmosphere of what we were led to assume was complete harmony, the assignment of functions and missions of the armed services contemplated a 70-group air force. The 55-group phase for which volunteer enlistment was providing more personnel than the Air Force could support or employ, was and is but a temporary phase of a program that in itself will be expanded greatly in the event of war.

No citizen of the United States might at any time during the last 3 years have been in ignorance as to the proposed size of the United States Air Force. No citizen needed ever to ask "How large an air force?"

What the thoughtful citizen might well have asked, and what the citizens of this democracy are asking now, in the face of increasing evidence of totalitarian aggression, is not "How large?" but "When?" When—how soon—are we to have the Air Force that we so earnestly need?

Until an international organization—by some miracle—gives us an international police force for the prevention of war, we have the choice of building a protective machine strong enough to discourage any possible aggressor or of remaining unprepared and defenseless and hoping that war will not occur. The first choice is the only intelligent choice,

and it is the choice this Congress has already made. We are going to have a unified military establishment strong enough to discourage acts of aggression against our independence, our sovereignty, and our democracy. And it seems clear that Congress has already decided what the first-line striking power of that establishment is going to be.

It is going to be a modern air force, capable of striking anywhere in the world from the United States, supported by a program of scientific research and development, of industrial readiness, and by adequate manpower. There are no insurmountable obstacles between us and security. We have the best scientists, the best airmen, designers, facilities, materials, and the most money of any nation in the world. There is no insurance we can buy which would be cheaper, or as cheap, as real air power.

Neither an army nor a navy can operate on a surface over which a hostile air force has control of the air. An air force can operate in the air over a surface controlled by a hostile army or navy, and can operate at tremendous speed, from great distance, and with the most disastrous effectiveness the world has yet seen. Obstacles of distance and terrain have been overcome by the Air Force; the barriers to ever-increasing speed is giving way before the attacks of aeronautical scientists and engineers. An adequate air force will permit us to strike at an enemy over any terrain that he controls. An air force adequate to give us this power is essential if our Army and our Navy are to be effectively used in those operations for which, admittedly, a strong army and a strong navy are still required.

An adequate air force is the key to our national security, and for one very significant reason, aside from the reasons I have just suggested. We have three national defense forces, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and one very powerful, possibly decisive, weapon, the atomic bomb. Of our three national defense forces, only one has the means of delivering our decisive weapon to the target where it can be used with most effectiveness. A crew of only a dozen men, flying one Air Force bomber, can carry an atomic bomb to the industrial heart land of an aggressor nation. One such crew dropped one atomic bomb on Nagasaki, another such crew dropped a single atomic bomb on Hiroshima. The rest is history.

When some future historian writes what happened as a result of decisions being made here today, is he to record that we would not provide an air force capable of defending the United States, ready for immediate retaliatory action, and prepared to use the weapon created by American science and American industry? Is he to record that we were unwilling to provide for ourselves the assurance of victory? Or will that historian write that with a proud navy patrolling our shores and a mighty army ready to meet the invader, we still went down in defeat for lack of an air force strong enough to protect us in the one element through which a twentieth-century enemy will first move—the element of the air?

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that this appropriation should be increased so as to provide for a 70-group air force to consist of about 20,000 up-to-date planes.

It seems that rivalry between the different branches of the services has obscured the issues involved. Too many admirals and generals cannot see the woods for the trees.

I have always favored a well-rounded defense program. In this program proper consideration must be given to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Primarily we must have adequate manpower for our armed forces. We are not now getting that adequate manpower through the volunteer system and, for that reason, I am ready to support the draft of men from 18 to 25 years of age, and also universal military training to provide a reservoir of partly trained men in the event war comes.

But, Mr. Chairman, what is proper balance between the branches of our armed service? When we speak of balance, we should not approach the subject from the standpoint of desire to provide equal appropriations for each branch of the service. The best balanced defense force is that force which can best meet the challenge of potential enemies. There is only one powerful nation in the world today which could be considered a potential enemy on the battlefield in the immediate years to come.

That nation has unlimited manpower and an active army five times the size of ours. That nation is building 12 times as many war planes today as is our own country. That nation has no Navy to speak of, except submarines, in which field the United States is far outnumbered.

It would seem, therefore, that we should cut our pattern of defense to meet the danger confronting us. We have not an adequate air force now, and the first essential is to build one. A program to build and to keep up to date an Air Force of at least 20,000 planes in the face of world conditions today seems essential.

We have the atom bomb; Russia soon may have it. In any event, we must have an Air Force large enough and strong enough to protect this country and, if necessary, carry the fight to the enemy.

It seems stupid to me for admirals to talk about a 70-group air force unbalancing our defense system. The thing for this Congress to do, in my opinion, is to provide money for this 70-group force and then balance our Army and naval power on this basis. There was a day when manpower and fire power on land were the dominant factors in any war. Later on sea power came into its own. For centuries Great Britain dominated the sea lanes of the world with sea power. During World War II, our Navy was our first line of defense. In another war our first line of defense will be our Air Force.

This is no time to allow petty jealousies to obscure the needs of the day. Neither time nor the national interest will permit neglect of the welfare of the Nation in order to preserve outmoded tradition

and the status of commanders who have eyes only for their own show.

I reiterate there is a place in our defense system for every branch of the service, and a proper place. We would be blind indeed, however, if we did not learn from the last war that in the next our first line of defense, as well as the first wave of offense, will be our Air Force.

I congratulate the Armed Services Committee on their unanimous backing of a 70-group air force.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the pending amendment because it will provide the full measure of Air Force which our military experts have recommended for the national defense of the United States in time of peace. I want to stress the fact that Secretary of Defense Forrestal, Secretary of the Air Forces Symington, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Forces General Spaatz have all assured the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, that the 70-group air force, which this amendment will underwrite, is designed to preserve peace and not to wage war. Secretary Symington, testifying before our committee this week in support of the 70-group program, made the following statement: "This is not a wartime program on any basis." The Chief of Staff, General Spaatz, in his testimony before the committee said:

The 70-group program is a peacetime air force necessary to give us the proper air posture. This program gives us a basis for expansion in case of an emergency—a platform to build on.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that if America had possessed a 70-group air force of the kind which is here contemplated, together with the atomic bomb, at the time when the dastardly sneak attack was made on Pearl Harbor, we could have knocked Japan out of the war within a very brief time. I am further convinced that if Japan had known that we had such an air force and such a weapon she would not have made any attack upon us. I believe that the knowledge of American air strength will deter any nation from waging war upon us in the future.

So, Mr. Chairman, I regard this vote as a vote for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of war.

To those who contend that any measure for the adequate military defense of this Nation is a gesture toward war, I can only reply that to leave ourselves defenseless while every other nation in the world is arming at a feverish pace would be the equivalent of national suicide. We know that the Russians are building, as fast as they can, what they hope will be the greatest air force in the world. Secretary Symington has stated that even if we get the 70-group air force Russia's air strength will be many times greater than ours. However, our military advisers are confident that with adequate peacetime defensive strength in the air, America will not be in danger of attack from Russia or any other nation.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Taber amendment. It is not advisable at this time to overlook the weighty testimony and findings in support of a 70-group air force program.

Scientific skill and technical advancement equal to that of any nation in the world, with a superior ability to use them, is unquestionably a formula for peace.

How cheaply we can purchase peace, no one knows. The development of first-line aircraft is expensive and requires constant research and improvement. Looking forward, however, in the unlimited field of aerial possibilities, we would not be realistic if we failed to keep old weapons ready, manned and in a position to defend our country.

A balanced air force includes a strong and effective naval air arm. We have not progressed to the point that the aircraft carrier is outmoded. It can be truthfully said, I believe, that it is one of the strongest components of our defense program. The strength and further development of the naval air arm complements the program of the United States Air Forces. The roles and missions of the naval air arm are unique, and in ability to accomplish its mission, it is unequalled in the world.

Our present weapons have not become obsolete as rapidly as we feared. Rockets that can be shot around the world are not presently imminent, so we must still concern ourselves with aircraft of known use. Until airplanes have been developed that can fly very swiftly with tons of bombs 10,000 miles or more, we must rely upon land bases and carriers sufficiently close to the target to permit operations in force against the enemy.

As we look to the future, Mr. Chairman, we must not be unmindful of the present, for upon a realistic use of present strength may depend what is to come.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this appropriation to supplement our national defense. In view of recent events, the turmoil, and uncertainties that have been increasing over a period of time makes it imperative that we provide and maintain an adequate preparedness program to meet any emergency.

I am intensely interested in the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee for the increase of funds over that reported by the committee for our Air Force. It think it is highly appropriate that this action be taken to increase our Air Force to the required and authorized strength of 70 groups. In fact, I have advocated this for months, Mr. Chairman, and it is unfortunate there has been some controversy in high places of our Government that has delayed this program.

This amendment would increase the authorization for the procurement of aircraft contracts, and so forth, to the extent of \$1,687,000,000. This money and authorization will be available until June 30, 1950, and it assures our Air Force that we will proceed immediately with this expansion program for our national security and well-being.

There is no opposition now to the bill as was reported, and the only question involved is, are we going to supply this additional authorization and funds to give us required strength. This will do it, and I am glad to see the Committee come to this resolution, which I believe will have the complete support and back-

ing of the people throughout the United States.

I was horrified and very much discouraged when I was in Germany last fall and advised by our military authorities that they had instructions to reduce the air force there from 25,000 by July 1 this year to 10,000. Conditions now are much more acute than they were then and such action on our part is wholly indefensible. It is gratifying to know that policy has changed and additional air strength is being provided for our occupation forces. The fleet that has just been sent to Berlin and Frankfurt will in my opinion have a tremendous influence on the constant threat of the Communist aggression.

Only yesterday, Mr. Chairman, did the chief publicity agent for the Communists in Berlin say that the Marshall aid and the strengthening of our forces meant war. This to me means that Russia intends to press her aggression even if it means war. They have their program well planned and it is their policy to continue to absorb nations making them their satellites and if such a program as we have provided and are providing interferes that they will go to war if necessary to accomplish their objectives.

Only today is it reported that 100 Stalin tanks have been sent to Berlin. This obviously is to enforce their present method and the only way that it can be met is by the program provided in this legislation.

I cannot urge too strongly the adoption of this amendment increasing the funds for our Air Force and passing the legislation as expeditiously as possible in order that this program may continue to get under way.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for an increase in the size of our Air Force.

Until we have an effectively organized world with a functioning police force, we must be strong enough to insure our national self-preservation.

At the same time we must not fall into the grave danger of relying on military might to insure the future. We should accelerate our efforts to revitalize and reorganize the United Nations to give it the power with which to meet future threats to peace.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GORE) there were—ayes 40, noes 74.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 115, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 2, line 25, insert "Provided further, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used in the branches of the Department of the Air Force in which there exists racial segregation."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this amendment is not germane and it is, therefore, not in order on this bill; that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; that imposes additional burdens and restrictions that are entirely out of place.

This is an aircraft procurement bill. This is not a labor bill. I submit that the amendment is out of order from practically every standpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. POWELL. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is an amendment which has limitations; it is negative; it is the type that has been ruled in order on previous appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from New York has offered an amendment against which the gentleman from Mississippi has made a point of order. The Chair is constrained to rule that the amendment is germane and is in order and consequently overrules the point of order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I just voted for the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee. I have just voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, which was passed. I did this because I believe that this bill before us is a defensive measure and, as a loyal American citizen, I would support any measure aimed at defending our borders. I believe that with the passage of this bill as amended all arguments for UMT or selective service will not be needed. This establishes our Nation now with 22,000 first-line planes, and I do not see the need of the draft or the UMT in such a situation. However, I serve notice now that I will vote against this bill and any bill in connection with our armed services which does not include definite and specific language abolishing Jim Crow of all types.

I do, however, believe that it is time, because this is a "dire emergency," as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has pointed out, to close ranks, and I am offering this amendment to the bill because this amendment will close ranks. If it is passed, I will support the bill. I have a cable from an outstanding Republican, probably the outstanding Negro Republican, Joe Louis. Joe Louis in his cable, printed in April 10 Afro-American, says:

It is time that we veterans who suffered the humiliation of Jim Crow trains, Jim Crow restaurants, Jim Crow railroad stations, Jim Crow Army barracks, and even Jim Crow telephone booths, rise in every corner of the land and say, "This shall not happen to our younger brothers."

It is time for all colored citizens—parents, sisters, wives, and the men in danger of being drafted—to let Congress, the Nation, and the world know in unmistakable terms that they will not accept this would-be permanent curse.

This is from an outstanding Republican, an outstanding citizen of our land.

May I also point out that I have correspondence from the Navy which came to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, in which the Navy, over the signature of its Judge Advocate General, Rear Admiral Colclough, said they had no objection to such an amendment as I am now proposing. The Navy Department interposes no objection to the enactment of the bill H. R. 279, now H. R. 4952, which is my bill, and which is the exact language of this amendment, that is, complete abolition of segregation in the armed forces. The Navy supports this amendment.

I have a letter which was also sent to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] over the signature of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, E. H. Foley, Jr., also saying that the Treasury has no objection to the enactment of H. R. 279, now H. R. 4952, which is the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I bring this before you as an American citizen who wants to see our ranks closed now, in peacetime. We did this during wartime. We had ships in our service during wartime, in the Coast Guard, in the Navy, and in the merchant marine with mixed crews. Why not do it now, before war comes, so we will be prepared at home?

American democracy practiced at home is the first line of defense. Planes, guns, and ships come next. Unless those planes, guns, and ships are manned in accordance with the democratic spirit of our Constitution and Bill of Rights, they will not be the type of weapon that will successfully bring our Nation to the pinnacle of victory.

I make no excuse, when I present this amendment, for the patriotism of my people, the Negro people. Back in the beginning of this Republic, the first blood that was shed that America might be free was shed on March 5, 1773, on Boston Common by a black man, Prispus Attucks. From the days of then until the days of now Negro people have been the most loyal minority in this democracy. The Negro people will stand ready at all times to defend this Nation, but they are saying, "We want some of the democracy here now at home that you are trying to sell abroad to other people and that you ask us to go ahead and fight for. We have proven our loyalty. We are asking for democracy now."

I ask you to support this amendment. Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not in the interest of the Negroes of the country. It would only tend to stir up friction, and at the same time it would embarrass and handicap the Air Force in carrying out the program we are trying to provide.

If you are going to try to inject this kind of amendment into your appropriations, the next one will probably go

further and further and further. Are you going to cripple our Air Force in order to carry out the demagoguery of somebody who does not have any interest at all in the masses of the Negro people of the country?

Go down South where I live, where more Negroes are employed than anywhere else in the country, where they enjoy more happiness, more peace, more prosperity, more security and protection than they have ever enjoyed in all history. They are not asking for this amendment.

Do you want us to cripple our Air Force in order to gratify some Negro politician?

If you adopt this amendment you will cripple our Air Force at a time when it will do our country the most harm and the Negroes the least good.

So I submit that this amendment be voted down—unanimously.

ABOLISH RACIAL SEGREGATION IN THE AIR FORCES

Mr. ISACSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, to terminate by congressional mandate the practice of racial discrimination and segregation of Jim Crow in the Air Force of the United States.

The policy now in force of segregation and discrimination for reasons of race or for any reason whatsoever is repugnant to our basic democratic principles.

The policy of Jim Crow is unfair, in that it withholds equality of opportunity and advantage from the Negro people who must nevertheless share equally in the cost of all activities and branches of Government on a share and share alike basis. In other words, a policy of discrimination in any activity supported out of general taxes in effect forces that portion of the taxpayers to foot the bill for discrimination against themselves.

A policy of discrimination and segregation is uneconomical. It deprives any enterprise upon which we may launch of the full and unlimited use of all the skills and talents which are available.

Obviously, the best results in any enterprise will be obtained if eligibility is determined solely on the bases of citizenship and qualification. It is clear, furthermore, that any system of selection of manpower by quota defeats itself in the light of this fact.

I am cognizant of the often-advanced theory—heard most recently in the hearings on universal military training—that legislation is the wrong way to advance the cause of integration of our society in any of its endeavors. Education and evolution will bring about the necessary changes, the proponents of this theory say.

This theory is inadequate in general; it is particularly inadequate when applied to the practices of our armed forces.

We have only to witness the recent dispute between the State of New Jersey and the War Department on the subject of segregation and discrimination to be assured that, without legislation, the Army will not relinquish its tradition of race discrimination.

The State of New Jersey by legislative action abolished segregation in its

State guard units. The War Department demanded that standard Army practices of segregation prevail. The State of New Jersey eventually won the argument, and segregation has ended in the armed forces mobilized by that State. But it was over the objections of the Army and not with the Army's cooperation.

This legislative safeguard must be included in order to insure the rights of all eligible citizens that they will not be denied equal opportunity and civil rights in a branch of our Nation's defenses in which they may be required to sacrifice their very lives in defense of democratic principles—which still include, I am sure, our hopes for equal rights and opportunities for all.

I am going to oppose this bill and all other bills providing for military appropriations until Jim Crow is ended—until bias and bigotry and discrimination are wiped from the face of America.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. It is a matter of simple justice to abolish segregation in all the branches of the armed forces.

We should be especially mindful of the Negro soldier, remembering that he fought and shed his blood for a freedom which he has not as yet been permitted fully to share. He made his contribution in World War II as he has in every other war in which we, a free people, have fought. It should never be forgotten that Negro heroes in that war achieved their proud records under handicaps that did not have to be overcome by most of their white fellow citizens. To ask them again to bear arms in the face of continued discrimination would add to those handicaps and go beyond the bounds of common decency.

It is always my fervent hope that we will have the wisdom to look upon citizens as citizens, and soldiers as soldiers—neither white nor black nor yellow—but simply as citizens of a working democracy and a world community.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has kindly loaned me this cable from Joe Louis. I read the first sentence:

It is time that we veterans who suffered the humiliation of Jim Crow trains, Jim Crow restaurants, Jim Crow railroad stations, Jim Crow Army barracks, and even Jim Crow telephone booths, rise in every corner of the land and say "That shall not happen to our younger brothers."

But I understood from the gentleman's remarks that during the war there had been little if any discrimination. Perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. In the Coast Guard none; in the merchant marine none; and in the Navy some.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Some, but very little?

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. So the situation has been gradually growing better. My point was that I would like to advise you—or inform you, perhaps is the bet-

ter word—that if Joe Louis would stay home where he belongs, and I have always admired Joe Louis, I think he is a fine outstanding—that is I thought he was a fine outstanding—American citizen. I never heard anything against him until this recent love-balm suit or whatever it may be. He has been known as a sober, churchgoing American, a credit to his race and our Nation. Joe Louis spends his summers and is going to do his training in Bloomingdale, Van Buren County, Mich., which is in my own district, so I am happy to tell you that I am a fellow citizen of Joe Louis. If he would quit wandering around in Europe and elsewhere he would be treated all right. He was never discriminated against in the Fourth Congressional District in Michigan. We have a law in Michigan which makes open to all on equal terms our transportation facilities—we do not have any Jim Crow cars, do we? You know that. You have traveled in my territory from Chicago to Detroit, I will say to the gentleman from New York. They all, regardless of race or color or religion, go in where they like. I know this, that the last time I came down from Kalamazoo to Detroit on the Century I noticed that, although I got in ahead of two Negro gentlemen and a Negro lady with a little girl, I was served after they were. The discrimination was against me. I did not care anything about it, made no protest, did not feel hurt, it amused me somewhat to see the colored waiters forget "first come, first served." And then when I went back to my seat in the car, being a little ill and having some little stomach disorder after the meal, I went in there, and right ahead of me was a bowler, a colored gentleman who was going down to New York to bowl in a tournament. The gentleman was smoking. I said to him, "Do you see that no-smoking sign?" He said, "I do not like your criticism. I do not like your talk, your tone." I said, "I apologize for the tone." I said, "I do not like your cigarette smoke." Then I said, "You see that sign?" And then I told him, "I cannot understand just why you are all the time yelling about discrimination and then when you get into this car, into this pullman with the rest of us, everything is all right and everything is nice but you are the only fellow in the car who is smoking, who is violating the rule." There was a smoking room in the car. No doubt the case was exceptional—but there it was—a clear case of discrimination by the one gentleman against all the rest of the occupants of the car. So if you will come to Michigan into the Fourth Congressional District and make your home there you will be happy there and I will welcome you providing you do not run against me for office, because I do not want you to do that. If you will come up there you will be treated just the same as the rest of our folks, there is no discrimination. I repeat, my advice to Joe is to come home to western Michigan and he will see no discrimination. The truth is you will find there has never been discrimination there—in the Fourth District—none at all in Michigan and very little in this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 14, noes 103.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS
Construction of aircraft and related procurement

For new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories therefore, including expansion of public plants, and government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants, and for the employment of group IVb personnel in the Bureau of Aeronautics necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, \$315,000,000, of which \$150,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, until June 30, 1949, to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed \$588,000,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances of the appropriations of \$310,000,000 and \$90,000,000 which were made available until expended for the foregoing purposes by the Navy Department Appropriation Act, 1947, and the Navy Department Appropriation Act, 1948, respectively, shall be consolidated with this appropriation, to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund: *Provided further*, That any obligation incurred hereunder shall be subject to the general provisions of the Navy Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year in which such obligation is incurred.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota.

On page 4, after line 1, insert:

"Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall report to the Committees on Appropriations and Armed Services of the Congress not later than June 30, 1948, and quarterly thereafter, the amounts obligated under the contract authorizations provided for in this act and such reports shall include a statement of finding by the President that the contracts let are necessary in the interests of the national defense and that the contract specifications insure the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment consistent with the defense needs of the United States.

"(b) All contracts entered into under this act shall include a clause providing for final settlement in accord with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945."

And in line 2 strike out "Section 2" and insert in lieu thereof "Section 3."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment may be called a committee amendment. It has been approved by members of the Deficiency Subcommittee, and is the amendment for which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] obtained consent yesterday that it might be in order on this appropriation bill.

The amendment does three things. First, it requires that the Secretary of Defense shall make quarterly reports

upon the progress of letting contracts under the authorizations created by this act.

The second thing is to require that these reports shall include a statement of finding by the President that the contracts let are necessary in the interest of the national defense, and—this latter part is more significant—that the contract specifications insure the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment consistent with the defense needs of the United States. At that point I want to inject just this comment:

In our aircraft procurement, probably more than in any other phase of national defense procurement, it is important that we get the latest gadget on the machine when it rolls off at the time we need it. We do not want to be building some flying coffins and get loaded up with them. We want to be sure that we have the very latest thing at the time of maximum need. The language here is designed to insure that that point is kept in mind in the timing and specifications, so that the maximum utilization of improvements in aircraft and equipment will be made, consistent with the probable defense needs of the United States at time of delivery.

The third part of the amendment provides that all contracts entered into under this act shall include a clause providing for final settlement in accord with the provisions of the Renegotiation Act as it was in effect July 1, 1945.

At that point today I merely wish to say that this gives us the benefit of the renegotiation procedure, as worked out in the experience of World War II. The final amendment to the Renegotiation Act was in effect on July 1, 1945, the date cited in this amendment, which, in effect, picks up the provisions of that act.

As I indicated yesterday, with the prospect of entering upon the large program which will be involved in effectuating a modern 70-group airplane program, it seemed to me that we should have the benefit of the renegotiation procedure which was initiated by an amendment which I offered to the sixth supplemental defense bill in the spring of 1942. The members of the subcommittee all heartily agreed. And this morning the chairman of the committee received a letter from Secretary of the Air Force Symington which said, in part:

Thanks for the wise move we understand you made with respect to installation of a renegotiation clause. * * * We believe * * * your action will result in millions of dollars being saved for the Government.

In the final wind-up following World War II, I might say that former Secretary of War Patterson estimated that over \$10,000,000,000 was recovered or saved through the renegotiation procedure and more than that in forward pricing. We are hoping by this amendment to take advantage of that procedure again in this large program of procurement which is being launched.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides vast sums for aircraft procurement for the Air Corps and for the Navy. I am in complete accord with that program. I want to see it carried out promptly in order to realize the establishment of the 70-group air force. I want to call the attention of the Congress to a situation that is developing, that I hope the proper departments of government can take cognizance of today, that is a very vital and necessary component and essential in connection with any over-all national defense program.

I have caused to be placed in the lobby out here an exhibit relating to the production and processing of hemp and hemp fiber. You may think that is of little importance, but let me call your attention to the fact that when we got into this last war we suddenly discovered that due to the interception and intervention of the German submarine the normal supply of foreign fibers that produced the cordage so necessary for our national defense program was cut off. The possible threat of a similar situation prompts me to make this statement.

I rise to discuss the need for a support-price program for American hemp.

Hemp is an annual crop that can be grown successfully in many sections of the United States for the production of fiber. The fiber is obtained from the stalks of the plant.

It is the only proven cordage fiber that has been produced on a large scale in continental United States. Prior to the Civil War it was our principal cordage fiber and all rope was made from hemp. In the 1850's the tropical fibers, abaca, sisal, hennequen, and jute, which could be imported more cheaply, began to supplant hemp. From 1860 on hemp production declined rapidly and from then to about 1915 all hemp grown in the United States was produced in Kentucky. In 1915 hemp growing shifted largely to Wisconsin.

In each of three recent wars in which the United States engaged, the planting of hemp expanded to meet our needs for fiber. Hemp-fiber was in demand during the Spanish-American War and played an important role in World War I. This war was chiefly responsible for the development of the hemp mill and the moving of the industry to Wisconsin, where conditions were favorable to the use of mills. German raiders greatly interfered with our normal supply of tropical fibers and we turned to hemp to augment the reduced supply of hard fiber.

In spite of the vital service this industry rendered in the First World War, it was forgotten soon after the armistice and allowed to wither and nearly die.

Fortunately for America a few patriotic and farsighted men kept the spark alive in Wisconsin, maintaining five small mills. They did so practically without profit to themselves. They were barren years, but the skills necessary to the production and processing of hemp were kept alive.

When America was plunged into World War II we again faced a critical shortage of the fibers which are so essential to our national economy and our national security.

In December of 1941 Germany had overrun all of Europe and Japan appeared likely to cut off our supply of fiber from India and the South Pacific.

It immediately became apparent that our policy of neglect with respect to the hemp industry has been short-sighted and we were facing a serious shortage of fibers needed to wage a global war.

The Government turned to the operators of the mills in Wisconsin for help in a desperate hour of need.

Government engineers went into these plants and made drawings of the special equipment needed to process hemp. They enlisted the aid of the men who had retained the know-how of growing the plant, treating the stalks after the harvest, removing the precious fiber from the stems, and processing it into the rope, twine, yarns, and threads so vitally needed by our armed forces.

The operators gave freely of their knowledge and skills and rallied the farmers of the area to grow hemp and more hemp.

The Government ordered the immediate construction of an additional 42 hemp-processing plants. Crops were grown in Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, and Minnesota.

In 1939 less than 3,000 acres of hemp was being raised. By 1943 a total of 185,000 acres were planted to hemp.

It was never possible during the years the Government hemp program was operating to meet War Production Board directives as to the amount of hemp that should be produced.

It took two full years to get into production on a sizable scale.

Had it not been for the small industry operating in Wisconsin the situation would have been much more difficult if not impossible of achievement.

When the emergency ended Government interest in the product again lapsed.

The 42 plants were declared surplus and 32 have been sold to private users for repair shops, laundries, and warehouses. Only one of the plants sold is now being used for the processing of hemp.

The vast surplus of fiber built up in accordance with War Production Board directives was dumped after the war into commercial channels where it became a glut on the market and a serious threat to the very existence of the original hemp companies that had come to the assistance of the Government so loyally during the war.

Commodity Credit Corporation turned the fiber over to the former customers of the hemp mills. Some of the spinners purchased the fiber in such great quantities at prices so far below the cost of production that they are now sellers instead of buyers.

The market for fiber now being produced in the original companies in my district in Wisconsin has virtually disappeared. Farmers have become hesitant about further plantings and the plant operators are faced with bankruptcy.

The operators of these companies are now pleading with the Department of Agriculture to do something to save the industry. They believe that so long as other crops are given support prices that this industry, because of its importance in times of emergency, merits support.

In addition to being a valuable product in times of war, hemp is an excellent crop for the farmers, especially in the dairy State of Wisconsin. Hemp does not exhaust the soil and is one of the best crops for smothering weeds. Hemp provides the kind of diversion that is needed to balance the profitable operation of a dairy farm.

The farmers who have participated in this hemp program are definitely of the opinion that hemp to them is just as essential as other crops now covered by the agricultural support program instituted in 1943.

The mills are operated on a cooperative plan but are not cooperative in law. The mills are valuable to the communities in which they are located in that they afford winter work for a considerable number of persons in localities where such winter work is often scarce. The period of operation is from November to late spring, making available a supply of farm labor during the season when in greatest demand.

From 1942 to 1945 Commodity Credit Corporation was the principal purchaser of hemp fiber at support prices established by Commodity. In 1946 there was a support price for the fiber but the industry was able to sell at better prices than the support price and no fiber was sold to the Government. The support prices established by Commodity Credit Corporation were as follows:

Line: Prime 28 cents; grade I, 25 cents; grade II, 22 cents; grade III, 18 cents; grade IV, 12 cents.

Tow: Grade I, 12 cents; grade II, 10½ cents; and grade III, 6½ cents.

The Hemp Producers Association has requested that a price-support program be established for American hemp grown in 1948 and milled in 1948-49, at mills operated in 1947. In view of the increased cost of growing and milling hemp, the association believes higher support prices are warranted on the 1948 crop. They suggest the following:

Line: Prime, 29 cents; grade I, 27 cents; grade II, 25 cents; grade III, 22 cents; grade IV, 15 cents.

Tow: Grade I, 14 cents; grade II, 12 cents; and grade III, 8 cents.

In requesting that a floor price be placed on domestic fiber for 1948, the producers are not asking for an indefinite program. They believe that the importance of the industry to national

security justifies support but they also feel that experiments being conducted in the degumming of hemp fiber, so that it can be used in textiles, will soon enable the industry to compete in the domestic bast fiber market without benefit of a support price.

In these experiments hemp fibers are being mixed with synthetic fibers such as rayon to give cloth now made from these fibers greater strength, better wearing quality, and less shrinkage. Textile men are now referring to hemp as the "wonder fiber."

But regardless of these bright prospects for hemp there are a number of important reasons why it is desirable that the Government take steps now to insure the maintenance of at least a small hemp industry in order to guarantee the United States' ability to increase production rapidly should it ever again become necessary.

We all know that the international outlook is alarming. In the event of the United States becoming involved in another war it would very probably be necessary to again produce cordage fibers within the United States in order to have an assured supply of long fiber for rope.

India now supplies about 98 percent of our jute. That country is severing its ties with Great Britain and for months bitter civil strife raged in various parts of India. Civil war in India could seriously curtail our supply of jute. Loss of our source of jute would probably make necessary an increase in the production of hemp.

The gentleman from Wisconsin is in complete accord with the position taken by the hemp growers and processors. The importance of the industry has been proven in the last two wars. With foreign relations as strained as they are, we believe it would be good policy to classify hemp as a critical material. The Government is stock piling fibers that are imported for emergency use. Why should not hemp, grown in our own country, be included in such a program so that our farmers could have this benefit. A stock-piling and support-price program could be coordinated so that all fiber which the domestic program could not use could be stock piled for emergency use.

Mr. Chairman, I have arranged to have a case of hemp and hemp products placed on display in the Speaker's lobby. I hope that the Members will take the time to inspect this material.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed by the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. My only purpose in rising is to suggest that the proper committees of this House give consideration to what he said and the suggestions he made. When the war began and we discovered that we needed to grow hemp in this country to provide rope for the Navy, because of the fact that the raw product from which rope is made could no longer be brought in because of the German submarines, the Government representatives came out to Iowa and established six or seven hemp plants in

the Third Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. The growing of hemp was an entirely new undertaking to us. These plants were built at an expense of over \$300,000 apiece. The agents of the Government went to the farmers and sold them the idea as a patriotic thing that they should take some of their land out of corn and put it into hemp. They did, and we discovered that we could grow hemp there in accordance with the desires of the Navy Department. Now, when the submarine menace was ended, we found that these hemp plants could not compete with foreign products. Many people suggested that, as a war measure, if for no other reason, we should work out some kind of a program which would enable hemp to be produced in this country in time of peace, as well as in time of war. The college at Ames, Iowa, has carried on some experiments to demonstrate that if given the proper support by the Government the growing of hemp could be undertaken in many places in the Midwest. I regret to say that, unfortunately, we did not have too much cooperation from the proper agencies of the Government, and these hemp plants have been sold at a very low price of about \$30,000 apiece, and hemp growing is out of the window during peacetime. With the situation existing as it now exists, with the threat of another submarine warfare which might be more effective against our shipping than anything we have encountered heretofore, I suggest that the proper committees should now consider the advisability of a program which will enable the hemp production in this country to survive in times of peace.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would the gentleman go so far, in addition to what he has said, and emphasize the necessity of our getting into this country from the Philippines high-quality fiber so that good rope for American agriculture plus our defense forces could be obtained?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I am not familiar with that, I may say. All I know is that we had difficulty in getting any kind of fiber from any place on account of the submarines. Therefore, during the war we had to produce hemp ourselves.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I know the gentleman is from a great agricultural State, Iowa, and represents a very distinguished district of farmers. You cannot get rope that is worth carrying home unless it is made of the strong fibers from the Philippine Islands. You can buy a piece of rope, but when you put a 1,500-pound steer or a 1,500-pound horse on the other end of a cheap rope you do not have a rope worth throwing toward the animal.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That may all be true; may I say to the gentleman, nevertheless, when we could not get that kind of rope the Navy was glad to get rope made of hemp grown in the Midwest.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the reason I say, in addition to what the gentleman said, let us not become dependent, because we will take care of the Philippines,

whether war or peace, and we might just as well let them produce some raw material and ship it to the United States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] have just called our attention to a wartime substitute for the fiber which we have formerly imported from the tropics. In the Speaker's lobby, I have just examined the interesting and instructive display of hemp and the fiber processed therefrom under the program which was adopted during the recent war. It seems a shame that so much money was invested during the war in these processing plants which afterward sold for so little. It is another illustration of the wastefulness of war. However, we must have such fiber, and if it is no longer to be gotten from abroad, then we must—as in time of war—provide it at home, even at great expense. I have asked for this time that I may call to the attention of my colleagues another fiber possibility which we used slightly in wartime and which we may again want to use either in peace or in war.

I am thinking now of yucca fiber. Most of this is a hard strong fiber obtained from the leaves of the yucca plant, especially that known as Spanish bayonet, which grows over a vast area in the Southwest. There are various kinds of yucca, and one known as beargrass produces a soft fiber very much like the fiber used in making burlap. Since I became Congressman from Arizona, I have asked the Bureau of Standards to give us tests and measurements on rope, cord, twine, and the like made from both hard fiber and soft fiber obtained from desert vegetation. These tests were found to be remarkably good in comparison. Therefore, I cannot feel that anyone may properly speak of such fiber as inferior in quality or strength. There is no question about the utility of the fiber, nor is there any question about the usable quantity which may be obtained. The chief question is about the processing of it.

During the First World War, large quantities of yucca foliage were harvested from the desert areas of Arizona and shipped to East St. Louis for processing. So great was the need at that time, with foreign supplies shut off, that the high cost did not prevent the processing of this fiber. The method used for decortication was rather crude, and left much to be desired, but it did enable a considerable production to be had during the First World War. However, when the war was over and something like normal trade was resumed, the imported article could be obtained at much less cost than this home-made article. During the Second World War, certain men attempted to promote this industry, basing it on improved machinery and processes; however, very little was done in spite of the serious need. One inventor claims that he now has a cheap and effective method to process yucca leaves in mass production on what amounts to an assembly-line basis, and can produce it as cheaply as the foreign article can be had even in peacetime. I am not prepared to vouch for the ac-

curacy of this claim, but I am inclined to give it credence. If it is true, the Nation's need for fiber for almost all industrial uses, including agricultural uses, may be taken from the desert areas of Arizona, California, New Mexico, Nevada, and Texas.

Since only the foliage of the yucca plant is used, and the plant itself is not cut or harmed, and since the foliage reproduces itself at short intervals, the yucca leaves can be harvested from a given area on a sustained-yield basis. This would make possible the location of processing plants in the center of a sufficiently large area to furnish the raw material on that basis.

The yucca plant is a very remarkable desert growth. It has mighty little utility for livestock men, but it has a variety of uses for supplying human needs. At the present moment we think of fiber as being the chief product, but there are several known byproducts which might ultimately become more valuable than the main product. The fiber has a great variety of uses, such as in rope, binder twine, cordage, and the like, but it has even more uses for packing, padding, and upholstering, to say nothing of being woven into fabric. It is thought that the soft fiber of the beargrass might be used for burlap for certain use in the manufacture of rugs and linoleum, and certainly for the use of bags and such containers. This is all dependent upon man's ingenuity and inventive ability to extract the fiber by machinery in mass production in a labor-saving way. Whether this great need is to be supplied from this new industry from the desert areas of the Southwest ought to be a matter of easy answer. I am glad to call it to the attention of the House today as a significant possibility at this critical time of shortage.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I had little expectation that I would ever take the floor on this subject. I refer to the new balcony at the White House. I speak at the suggestion of a number of citizens and constituents who have visited Washington this spring, during the last 2 months, and all Republicans. I assume that all of you likewise have constituents who visit here, and they all seem to want to see the White House from the rear so they can see the balcony, of which they have heard so much.

It was the unanimous opinion of my friends, and I join with them now that the balcony is finished, that it is a fine job. One of these constituents was an architect. I think without any question it improves the general appearance of the White House from the south. It adds to the picture. It fills out a certain vacuum that was there with the columns alone. Furthermore, I understand it will save something through the years in money in the purchase of awnings, in view of the

fact it will give some shade to the ground floor below.

I am very happy to make this little statement today on behalf of the President's so-called project and compliment him on his good judgment in the architectural design approved and the nerve to go ahead and have the balcony built.

I am very glad to have this opportunity, on behalf of those of my constituents who were here, all Republicans, to say that we thoroughly approve it. As they said, "What a mountain they made out of a molehill."

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the "Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1948."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. O'HARA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. KERR. I am opposed to some features of it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The gentleman says that he is opposed to some features of the bill. My understanding of the rules is that the gentleman must be opposed to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has stated that he is opposed to some features of the bill, and the Chair must interpret that to mean that he is opposed to the bill.

The gentleman from North Carolina qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KERR moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 3, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—343

Abbitt	Donohue	Kearney
Abernethy	Dorn	Kearns
Albert	Doughton	Keating
Allen, Calif.	Douglas	Kee
Allen, Ill.	Durham	Keefe
Allen, La.	Ellis	Kelley
Almond	Ellsworth	Kennedy
Andersen	Elsasser	Kerr
H. Carl	Elston	Kilburn
Anderson, Calif.	Engel, Mich.	Kilday
Andresen	Engle, Calif.	King
August H.	Fallon	Kirwan
Andrews, Ala.	Fellows	Klein
Andrews, N. Y.	Fenton	Knutson
Angell	Fernandez	Kunkel
Arends	Fisher	Landis
Arnold	Fletcher	Lane
Auchincloss	Fogarty	Lanham
Banta	Folger	Latham
Barden	Foot	Lea
Barrett	Forand	LeCompte
Bates, Ky.	Fuller	LeFevre
Bates, Mass.	Fulton	Lemke
Beall	Gamble	Lesinski
Beckworth	Garmatz	Lewis
Bender	Gary	Lichtenwalter
Bennett, Mich.	Gathings	Lodge
Bennett, Mo.	Gavin	Love
Blackney	Gearhart	Lucas
Bland	Gillette	Ludlow
Blatnik	Goff	Lyle
Bloom	Goodwin	Lynch
Boggs, Del.	Gore	McConnell
Bonner	Gossett	McCormack
Bradley	Graham	McCowan
Bramblett	Granger	McCulloch
Brehm	Grant, Ala.	McDonough
Brooks	Grant, Ind.	McDowell
Brophy	Gregory	McGarvey
Brown, Ga.	Griffiths	McGregor
Brown, Ohio	Gwinn, N. Y.	McMahon
Bryson	Gwynne, Iowa	McMillan, S. C.
Buchanan	Hagen	MacKinnon
Buck	Hale	Mack
Buffett	Hall	Madden
Burke	Edwin Arthur	Mahon
Burleson	Hall	Maloney
Busbey	Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa
Butler	Halleck	Mason
Byrnes, Wis.	Hand	Mathews
Camp	Hardy	Meade, Ky.
Canfield	Harness, Ind.	Meade, Md.
Cannon	Hart	Merrow
Carson	Harvey	Meyer
Case, N. J.	Havenner	Michener
Case, S. Dak.	Hays	Miller, Calif.
Celler	Hébert	Miller, Conn.
Chadwick	Hedrick	Miller, Md.
Chapman	Hendricks	Mills
Chelf	Herter	Mitchell
Chenoweth	Heselton	Monroney
Church	Hess	Morris
Clason	Hill	Morrison
Clevenger	Hinshaw	Muhlenberg
Clippinger	Hobbs	Multer
Coffin	Hoeven	Mundt
Cole, Kans.	Hoffman	Murdock
Cole, Mo.	Holmes	Murray, Tenn.
Combs	Hope	Murray, Wis.
Cooley	Horan	Nicholson
Cooper	Huber	Nixon
Corbett	Hull	Nodar
Cotton	Jackson, Wash.	Norblad
Coudert	Jenison	Norton
Courtney	Jenkins, Pa.	O'Brien
Cravens	Jennings	O'Hara
Crawford	Jensen	Owens
Crosser	Johnson, Calif.	Pace
Curtis	Johnson, Ill.	Passman
Dague	Johnson, Ind.	Patman
Davis, Ga.	Johnson, Okla.	Patterson
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Tex.	Peden
Davis, Wis.	Jones, Ala.	Peterson
Dawson, Utah	Jones, N. C.	Philbin
Deane	Jones, Wash.	Phillips, Calif.
D'Ewart	Jonkman	Phillips, Tenn.
Dolliver	Judd	Pickett
Domengeaux	Karsten, Mo.	Poage
Dondero	Kean	Potter

Potts
Poulson
Preston
Ramey
Rankin
Rayburn
Redden
Reed, N. Y.
Rees
Reeves
Regan
Rich
Richards
Riley
Rizley
Robertson
Rockwell
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rohrbough
Ross
Russell
Sabath
Sadiak
St. George
Sanborn
Sarbacher

Sasscer
Schwabe, Mo.
Schwabe, Okla.
Scoblick
Scrivner
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheppard
Short
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Smathers
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
Somers
Spence
Stanley
Stefan
Stevenson
Stockman
Sundstrom
Taber
Talle
Teague

Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Tibbott
Tollefson
Towe
Trimble
Van Zandt
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Wadsworth
Walter
Welchel
Welch
Wheeler
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood
Woodruff
Youngblood

NAYS—3

Isacson

Marcantonio

Powell

NOT VOTING—84

Bakewell
Battle
Bell
Bishop
Boggs, La.
Bolton
Boykin
Buckley
Bulwinkle
Byrne, N. Y.
Carroll
Chiperfield
Clark
Cole, N. Y.
Colmer
Cox
Crow
Cunningham
Dawson, Ill.
Delaney
Devitt
Dingell
Dirksen
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliott
Evins
Feighan
Flannagan

Gallagher
Gillie
Gordon
Gorski
Gross
Harless, Ariz.
Harris
Harrison
Hartley
Heffernan
Hollifield
Jackson, Calif.
Jarman
Javits
Jenkins, Ohio
Kefauver
Keogh
Kersten, Wis.
Larcade
Lusk
McMillen, Ill.
Macy
Manasco
Mansfield
Miller, Nebr.
Morgan
Morton
Norrell
O'Konski

O'Toole
Pfeffer
Ploeser
Plumley
Price, Fla.
Price, Ill.
Priest
Rains
Reed, Ill.
Riehlman
Rivers
Rooney
Sadowski
Scott, Hardie
Scott
Hugh D., Jr.
Sikes
Smith, Maine
Stigler
Stratton
Taylor
Thompson
Twyman
Vail
West
Whitten
Worley

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Gordon.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Gorski.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Price of Illinois.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. McMillen of Illinois with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Jenkins of Ohio with Mr. Carroll.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.

Mr. Macy with Mr. Larcade.
Mr. Jackson of California with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Bakewell with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Rains.
Mr. Crow with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Harrison.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Richards.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Dingell.
Mrs. Smith of Maine with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Harris.
Mr. Riehlman with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Reed of Illinois with Mr. Delaney.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Cunningham with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Bishop with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Ross with Mr. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Morgan.
Mr. Devitt with Mr. Rooney.
Mr. Twyman with Mr. Eberharter.
Mr. Morton with Mr. Hollifield.
Mr. Plumley with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Vail with Mr. Evins.
Mr. Gillie with Mr. Manasco.
Mr. Gross with Mr. Harless of Arizona.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WE ARE ENTITLED TO KNOW

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, it has been well said that 1948 is America's year of decision. In this year will be decided the question of leadership which may affect our national future in a vital measure. Leadership to be chosen this year may well determine whether the United States of America, as we now know it, will continue to live as a nation of free men.

With that somber thought before us, I urge attention of every Member of Congress, every Representative of a congressional district in each one of the sovereign States, to the need of knowing not only the candidate who seeks elevation to leadership, but the backers of each candidate, what motivates them, and him.

Today we are viewing the returns from the second of two State-wide Presidential preference primaries in which major candidates for the nomination of the Republican Party for President went before the people.

The first was that in Wisconsin on April 6. As you all know, Harold Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, won 19 delegates to the Republican National Convention, and Gen. Douglas MacArthur 8. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, third competing candidate, won no delegates.

Examination of that primary's figures reveals that a change of from two to five votes in each of the election precincts in the State would have changed the entire picture.

The Nebraska primary of April 13 shows that Stassen, competing in a seven-man primary race, polled approximately 43 percent of the total vote cast as against approximately 35 percent polled by the second high man, Governor Dewey, of New York. Approximately 22 percent of the vote was spread among the five other candidates—Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio; Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan; General MacArthur; Gov. Earl Warren of California, and Speaker Joseph W. Martin, Jr., of Massachusetts—in that order of finish.

In that 22 percent of the total vote cast for other than the first two candidates in the Nebraska voting is the vote which may determine which of the seven candidates is the real choice of the people of Nebraska. It could elect either.

In both primaries the most cogent observation made is that a well organized, smoothly functioning political organization, working down to the level of the precinct, produced the narrow margin of victory—a 5-percent switch would more than cover a change of top rating.

This evidence of the results of a well-organized machine's ability to win is particularly true of primary elections where a comparatively small portion of the vote at the general Presidential elections in November turn out. Obviously, the fewer the total number of voters, the more effective is the voting of the organized body of voters in the working force of a machine.

Only the naive will say that political machines are not expensive.

Headquarters must be established and manned.

Vast quantities of campaign literature must be printed and distributed.

Radio time must be scheduled—and paid for.

Newspaper advertising must be provided—and paid for.

Halls must be provided for meetings.

Transportation must be provided, and housing accommodations, for speakers and their staffs.

The more extensive the organized political campaign, the greater the amount of money which must be spent.

It is no political secret that some men and certain groups of men, for various reasons, some selfish, some good, some bad, intensely interested in the election of Government leaders, contribute, directly or indirectly, to the campaigns of both major political parties. Under this system, no matter which party wins, these individuals or groups see a man elevated with whom they have favorable contact.

Existing laws provide means by which the voting public may be informed of the amounts of money spent for candidates for national office by all parties in the general elections.

No law provides any means by which the voting public may be informed of the amounts of money spent by candidates seeking party nomination at primaries or at State conventions, at higher than State level. No publication is required under existing law of the amounts spent nationally by candidates seeking party nomination for the office of President, Vice President, or Presidential elector.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this question of financing of candidates for nomination to national or State office is something that every voter is entitled to know before that candidate is nominated. The financing of a candidate may well indicate the motivation of his backers.

Mr. Stassen, the winner in the Wisconsin and the Nebraska primaries, in each of which the smoothly functioning political machine backing Mr. Stassen has been a matter of press comment, has made a practice in his political meetings of opening up the closing periods of those meetings to questions from his audience.

I would like to ask Mr. Stassen, not from the floor of one of his meetings, but from this floor, a few pertinent, relevant questions. I hope that he will answer them as freely and as openly as he has answered other political questions during the last 2 years.

Question 1: In view of reports of the high cost of the Stassen campaign for Presidential nomination—some estimates ranging as high as \$750,000—are you willing to state the aggregate amount made available to your campaign, and either spent or remaining available to be spent prior to the Republican National convention? You, or your headquarters, presumably know these amounts on both a national basis and on the basis of funds raised and used in your behalf by State organizations.

Question 2: Are you willing to name the contributors to your campaign funds, National or State, individual or group, whose contributions have exceeded \$100?

This figure is used because it is the figure on which treasurers of political committees are required to report to the Clerk of the House on contributions and expenditures in general elections.

Question 3: How many of the men active financially or politically in furthering your aspirations for the Republican Presidential nomination were active in the 1940 and 1944 campaigns of Wendell Willkie?

Question 4: How many financial contributors to your campaign for Presidential nomination are connected with international banking interests, or with the so-called big business groups, and with what groups?

I have heard reports, Mr. Speaker, that the aggregate of funds, contributed to National and State committees backing the Stassen campaign, may be as high as \$750,000. I do not know that this is so, but if it should be as much as half of that amount I believe the voters of America should know it, and the names and business connection of those who provided the money.

There is no charge that it is illegal, or that it is wrong for individuals or groups seeking the election of a man they believe is a proper man, to provide that man with the necessary funds to put his qualifications before the voters.

But, Mr. Speaker, I contend that the same public accounting for contributions and expenditures for nominated candidates at general elections should also apply to the contributions and expenditures on behalf of candidates seeking nomination. The time for full publicity about backers and motivation is before two men are named by national conventions to go before the people. The time for publicity is not after nomination when the grass-roots voters may only make a choice between two.

Some members of the press, and some professional politicians, seem amazed at the strength shown by Mr. Stassen in Wisconsin and Nebraska. To those of us who are not politicians, there is nothing startling nor amazing in the result of the primary vote. While other candidates have been attending to their official duties, Mr. Stassen, footloose and fancy free, has been personally meeting the voters. To them he is a real individual. They have seen him; they have heard him; many of them have shaken his hand. They have listened to his pleasing generalities, and naturally, as every candidate for office knows, personal contact with the individual voter is the way to get his support. The people, however, are entitled to know just who, what interests, are back of Mr. Stassen. Some, before they vote for the selection of a Republican candidate for the Presidency, would like to know whether he is an internationalist, whether the candidate thinks more of the interests of other countries than he does of those of our country. They would like to know whether he is supported by or is under obligation to so-called one-worlders or internationalists.

Mr. Stassen appears to be the kind of a young man who would not forget or ignore his friends and supporters. Everyone realizes that friendship creates

obligations. Everyone knows that a man is influenced by those who assist him. And because Mr. Stassen—should he win the Presidential nomination and election—will undoubtedly be influenced by those who contribute to his campaign, either financially or in other ways, because he will undoubtedly surround himself, as do all successful candidates, with those who assisted him, the people, as a matter of right and fairness, should be advised by Stassen of the answers to the questions which are here most respectfully submitted.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, III.

Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of a world government.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. SARBACHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently delivered by Congressman PATTERSON, of Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and includes a resolution adopted by the Queens County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Henry T. Stichman. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$337, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Consent Calendar be called on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the committees in order on Calendar Wednesday next be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to announce the program for next week. As has been indicated, we will meet at 11 o'clock on Monday. On Monday, as fixed by order, there will be a joint session commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of Cuban independence.

On Tuesday the Consent and Private Calendars will be called.

On Wednesday we expect to take up the bill S. 1641, known as the WAC-WAVE bill.

On Thursday the Condon resolution of inquiry will be considered.

The program for Friday is undetermined.

I think I should point out that additional rules which may be reported out of the Committee on Rules may be called up.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include a radio speech and in the others some extraneous material.

THE LATE GEORGE EWING MARTIN

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the passing of Judge George Ewing Martin, late Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. He died last night here in Washington, at the age of 90. Born in Lancaster, Ohio, in 1857, he served 33 years on the bench, first as a common-pleas judge of the old seventh judicial district of Ohio, then, by appointment of three Presidents, as a Federal judge. He was appointed by President Taft to the Court of Customs Appeals in 1911; appointed by President Harding as Chief Justice of that court in 1923, and appointed by President Coolidge in 1924 as Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals, serving for 13 years until his retirement in 1937. He was of a distinguished line of lawyers who have carried on for over 100 years in Lancaster, Ohio. His father, John D. Martin, was a lawyer, beginning in the forties of the last century; his son, William K. Martin, now deceased, practiced in Lancaster, and his grandson, George Denman Martin, still carries on the great family tradition in Lancaster.

Judge Martin was my great-uncle, but the courtly, kindly man known always to me as Uncle George will go down in the history of this country's jurisprudence as an able, intelligent, and industrious

judge, whose wisdom, scholarship, and fairness for over a third of a century in State and Federal courts dealt even-handed justice in hundreds of cases and helped to form and improve the principles of American law.

AIR DEFENSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen on the Committee on Appropriations, as well as on the Aviation Policy Board, and the House in general will be glad to know that in a long distance telephone call I have just received from Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, who was chairman of the President's Commission on Air Policy, he congratulated the committee and the House for providing the additional amount of money for the Air Force. I am sure the House will agree with us, as well as with the President's Commission and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board that proper action was taken today to insure the United States of an adequate air defense.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LICHTENWALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Allentown Chronicle.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the winning essay in the contest sponsored by the American Legion of Ohio.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Chicago Herald-American of April 15, showing the Communist domination of the CIO Packing House Workers Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I obtained permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that the extraneous matter exceeds the amount allowed under the rules and will cost \$189.34. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] are absent today on official business in connection with the investigation of the foot-and-mouth disease, and for that reason were not present to vote on the appropriation bill which was just passed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Tillamook News.

THE ITALIAN ELECTIONS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the Boston Herald of April 8, 1948. The headline says "United States to buy Italian election." Now, nobody can ever accuse the Boston Herald of being either pro-labor or even slightly liberal. Yet we have here an open and avowed admission and confession of what certain elements in these United States are trying to do under the name of preserving democracy in Europe.

I would like to know just what kind of democracy this is.

May I call attention also to a sentence in this same article, which reads as follows:

Political methods similar to those once employed by the old Pendergast machine in Kansas City are to be used by the Truman administration in an effort to sway the April 18 elections in Italy away from the Communists.

This is not limited to just Truman and the Democrats. It also says:

Dulles master-minds new "cold war" plan under secret agents.

So the bipartisan policy of war and depression for Wall Street monopoly is being carried out to an extent which our children and our children's children will look upon as a disgrace and a blot on the history of the great American people. And I am confident that the American people will respect the Italian people who refuse to be bribed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five instances and to include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the city clerk and treasurer of Greenwood.

Mr. HAYS asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, it is not an easy thing to voluntarily dissociate

yourself from membership in this the greatest parliamentary body on the face of the earth. However, I had rather go as a matter of volition than to be recalled, even though I have entertained no fear as to the latter in view of the overwhelming reassurance from my district.

I have enjoyed my brief service here. I have tried in my humble way, with what I considered becoming modesty, to represent a great district and to make my feeble contribution within the limitations of my meager talents to the cause of the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

This is a great fraternity of men. At times we do not know Democrats from Republicans, because all of us, I am sure, endeavor to the best of our ability to represent that which is for the best interests of this Nation in a critical hour in world history. I go back to Virginia to serve my State as attorney general. No Virginian can be heedless to the call of his native State. I shall never forget and I shall ever treasure as a tender spot in the garden of memory the friendships I have made, the help and the cooperation I have received from both sides of the aisle; and if I had my way, although this statement may be considered as political heresy, with rare exception I would reelect so many in this body now to serve in the next Congress of the United States.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that your fairness, your devotion to duty, your impartiality, your determination to preside over this great body in keeping with the fine and high traditions which have been established by your predecessors have not only endeared you to both sides of the House but have endeared you to the American people. It has been an honor and a privilege to serve under the leadership of the present distinguished Speaker and an equal honor and privilege to serve under the leadership of the great statesman from Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I am delighted to yield to my friend from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. Just a word to let you know that we respect to the full the sentiments that you have expressed. We love you, we love the district from which you come, not only because it sent us you but your predecessor, Cliff Woodrum, whom we knew so well, and therefore we loved your district even before you came, and we love it more now. We are so regretful that the good fortune of Virginia is made in having you to ascend the throne with single responsibility as her attorney general.

We wish you all Godspeed and the best of luck in everything wherever it may take you, and as long life as it makes you happy.

Mr. ALMOND. I thank the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I yield to my distinguished friend from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I wish to echo the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Roanoke, Va., and say to the House

that it was my privilege to speak in his home city. I learned there that he had endeared himself to the people of Virginia and to the district he represents just as he has endeared himself to the membership of this House on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. ALMOND. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. I, as chairman of the great Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, wish to acknowledge the very splendid, outstanding, patriotic service on that committee by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who has the floor.

Mr. ALMOND. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I have had the privilege of sitting on the gentleman's right in the great Committee on the Post Office and the Civil Service, and I want to tell him that in my heart the chair will always be vacant on the left.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, in closing may I quote those words from the King's Message:

And I said to the man who stood at the gate of the year: "Give me a light that I may tread safely into the unknown."

And he replied: "Go out into the darkness and put thine hand into the hand of God. That shall be to thee better than light and safer than a known way."

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, as shown on pages 2266-2269 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of March 5, 1948, Mr. John Andrews, Clerk of the House, and Mr. Robert E. Stripling, clerk and chief investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities, advised the Speaker in writing that each had been served with a subpoena duces tecum issuing out of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. These subpoenas required each to appear before that court on the day named in the subpoenas and to bring with them certain files, papers, and documents which are the property of the House and in the custody of, and under the control of, said Clerk of the House of Representatives and said clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Each of these clerks, recognizing the privileges of the House as established by rule and precedent, asked the Speaker for instruction as to what his action should be in the premises.

Said subpoenas were returnable on March 8, 1948. However, the said court proceedings were adjourned until a future date and said clerks now ask for specific instruction concerning their responding to said subpoenas duces tecum.

I am sure it is the purpose of the Speaker as well as the House to cooperate at all times with the courts of the land to the end that justice shall prevail. At the same time the privilege and the dignity of the House are involved, and these

clerks, performing necessary duties in the functioning of the House, should not and cannot be required to respond to subpoenas issuing from the courts at a time and in such manner as will interfere with the functioning of the Congress. The Constitution and the precedents heretofore established confirm this conclusion.

After consultation with the Parliamentarian and the Speaker, I present three privileged resolutions and I ask for their immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 540

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.

Whereas in the case of the *United States v. George Marshall* (No. 376-47, Criminal Docket) pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpoena duces tecum was issued by the Chief Justice of said court and addressed to Robert E. Stripling, clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 8th day of March 1948, at 10 a. m., and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Robert E. Stripling, clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena afore-mentioned.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I note that in the resolution reference is made

to the 8th day of March. That was the date these gentlemen were subpoenaed to appear but the case, by agreement, was adjourned until a subsequent date. This resolution will permit these Representatives of the House to appear at such times as will not interfere with the work of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer another privileged resolution (H. Res. 541) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States v. George Marshall* (No. 367-47, Criminal Docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpoena duces tecum was issued by the Chief Justice of said court and addressed to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 8th day of March 1948, at 10 a. m., and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promoting of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That John Andrews, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a further resolution (H. Res. 542).

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States v. John Howard Lawson* (No. 1352-47, Criminal Docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpoenas duces tecum were issued by the Chief Justice of said court and addressed to John Andrews, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 13th day of April 1948, at 10 a. m., and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That John Andrews, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena duces tecum before-mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpoena duces tecum then the said court through any of its officers or agents have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena aforementioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poll taken at the American University entitled "Opinionaire for Graduate Seminar in International Affairs."

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], who has been unavoidably detained en route from his district to the Capitol, may I say that he has wired me that he is in favor of an air force which in number and power should be superior to any air force in the world, and that if it were possible for him to be present at this time he would vote for this appropriation to strengthen our Air Force.

THE LATE PRESIDENT ROXAS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, a message has just been received stating that President Roxas of the Philippine Islands passed away very suddenly this afternoon. I feel that the Members of the House are interested in having this information.

It has been my privilege to know President Roxas for some 15 or 20 years and to work with him on many industrial matters pertaining to the interests of the people of the Philippines and the United States. I considered him one of the outstanding political leaders of the Philippines, a man of great ability in industrial, financial, and political fields. This news comes to me with a great shock. It will mean a tremendous loss to the people of the Philippine Islands. He was a man who could well be used in the reconstruction of the Philippine Islands as a result of the terrible war which occurred in the last few years.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I too am shocked and grieved by this sad news. I want to associate myself with what the gentleman from Michigan has said regarding President Roxas.

He was a man of extraordinary ability, industry, and forthrightness, and was doing an unbelievably good job in a most difficult situation. When the gentleman made this announcement I thought how similar is the situation in the Philippines to that when Abraham Lincoln was stricken down and Seward said, "God is in His heaven, and the Republic still lives." The Republic of the Philippines must live, too, and with increased and renewed support from the United States.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota and join with him in the statement that the Philippine Republic must go ahead. I repeat what I said only a few moments ago on the floor, at which time I did not have this news, that the United States will continue to support the Philippine Republic in peacetime as well as in war.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DR. CONDON

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the press to the attacks made by the Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities against Dr. E. U. Condon, director of the National Bureau of Standards, is one of the most striking occurrences in my congressional experience. Irrespective of political leanings, the newspapers of this country, from East to West and North to South, have denounced the procedures and tactics used by this committee. Typical of the opinions expressed are these few phrases: "Punishment by publicity," "Trial by headline," "Government by suspicion," "Masterpiece of unfair innuendo," from such reputable journals as the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, and the New York Herald Tribune.

But the press of the Nation was not alone in its condemnation of the tactics and procedures in the attacks on Dr. Condon. A great body of citizens—leaders throughout the Nation—has expressed profound indignation at the treatment accorded this honored and distinguished scientist and American. Eminent individuals and important organizations have voiced their distaste for and censure of the conduct of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Organizations and societies, individuals, and spontaneous meetings responded almost instantaneously and electrically to this unsubstantiated indictment and judgment of Dr. Condon.

REACTION OF NOTED SOCIETIES

Foremost among the organizations to express confidence in the integrity of Dr. Condon and speak out in protest against the action of the Committee on Un-American Activities was the American Physical Society, which had never in its long and distinguished history commented upon any public issue. The New York Herald Tribune, commenting on this action, reported on March 5, 1948:

The American Physical Society, in a move unprecedented for an organization devoted exclusively to the affairs of pure science, entered the field of politics yesterday with a letter vigorously assailing the actions of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in reference to Dr. Edward U. Condon.

The letter was addressed to the President and to Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker of the House. In content it was similar to others sent by organizations of scientists, such as a letter sent yesterday to the President by the American Association of Scientific Workers. The distinction between this message and those from other organizations lies in the fact that the American Physical Society prides itself on its aloofness from all matters except the intricacies of pure physics.

The letter was signed by the council of the society, headed by Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton, N. J., and president, as Dr. Condon was before him, of the American Physical Society.

"Stressing the confidence in Dr. Condon that led 6,000 of his fellow physicists

to elect him to the highest post in their possession," continued the Herald Tribune, the American Physical Society addressed the following open letter to the President of the Senate, Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, and the Speaker of the House, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN:

Dr. Edward Condon, whose loyalty has been attacked by a public report of the Subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, is a colleague of ours. That we have every confidence in him as a scientist and as a man is shown by his election 2 years ago to the presidency of the American Physical Society. He has held positions of great responsibility and trust in industry, in universities, in several vital phases of the war effort, and in several branches of the Federal Government. All of these positions are marks of confidence on the part of people whose judgment cannot be ignored.

We are, of course, not qualified to evaluate the incidents which have been adduced as a cause for doubt of his loyalty. Should these incidents provide ground for such doubt they should be most carefully evaluated. Yet it is clear that the action of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities was not to evaluate such incidents or to resolve such doubt but to create a situation in which this would be most difficult. We have grave fear that their action will tend to frustrate efforts of the Government to avail itself of our scientific resources and will make difficult the collaboration between scientists and the Government, on which so much of our future depends.

Respectfully submitted by the officers and council of the American Physical Society.

J. R. Oppenheimer, President; Karl K. Darrow, Secretary; George B. Pegram, Treasurer; J. A. Bearden; J. W. Buchta; Karl T. Compton; Henry Crew; Lee A. DuBridge; Harvey Fletcher; F. W. Loomis; Theodore Lyman; Ernest Merritt; R. A. Millikan; P. M. Morse; I. I. Robi; Frederick Seitz; W. F. G. Swann; John T. Tate; Louis A. Turner; Merle A. Tuve; George E. Uhlenbeck.

Meanwhile the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, one of the most distinguished and venerable groups of scholars and professional men, with a history extending back to colonial times, studied the attacks and advised its members as follows:

To the Fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences:

GENTLEMEN: A committee consisting of the undersigned has been appointed by the council of the academy to report to the fellows regarding the attack on Dr. E. U. Condon, fellow of the academy, and Director of the National Bureau of Standards, by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We have looked into the published information, consisting of the report to the full committee of the Special Subcommittee on National Security, of the Committee on Un-American Affairs; correspondence and press releases from the committee and the Department of Commerce; and an address and release to the press and radio by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California. These documents leave in our minds no doubt but that the committee has attacked Dr. Condon in the press, by the use of insinuation and innuendo, without producing valid evidence of disloyalty. The Secretary of Commerce takes the same view, and supports Dr. Condon's loyalty, as have the investigating agencies which have looked into his record.

The charges against Dr. Condon consist largely of statements that he has associated

with certain diplomatic representatives of Poland and other eastern European countries; that he belongs to a certain American-Soviet Science Society; that he has made friendly speeches regarding Russian scientists; and that he has encouraged the interchange of scientific reports with Russia. They omit to state that the diplomatic representative most discussed was a member of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, and a fellow physicist, with whom Condon would naturally have scientific dealings; that the American-Soviet Science Society is an organization, sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, for the purpose of making reports of Soviet research available in this country; that the friendly speeches were made soon after the war, when a resumption of scientific relations between this country and the Soviet Union was desired generally by American scientists. One gets the impression, from reading the attack, that the House committee is interpreting a natural desire to share the results of scientific research internationally as evidence of disloyalty.

Such persecution of Government scientists can only result in a reluctance on the part of reputable scientists to take Government positions, at a time when effective Government science is of the greatest importance to the welfare of the country. We believe that the academy should go on record as opposing such methods. We propose the following statement of our position:

"The fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences condemn the un-American procedure of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in publishing in the public press charges of disloyalty against Dr. E. U. Condon, on evidence which clearly appears inadequate, and without giving him an adequate opportunity to present his case."

P. W. BRIDGMAN,

Professor of Mathematics and
Natural Philosophy, Harvard University.

E. M. MORGAN,

Professor of Law,
Harvard University.

J. C. SLATER,

Chairman, Professor of Physics,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In a statement signed by Dr. Albert Einstein and Nobel prize winner Dr. Harold Urey, the Emergency Committee of Atomic Scientists charged the Committee on Un-American Activities with a disservice to the United States in its attack upon Dr. Condon. The New York Herald Tribune summarized the statement of the group as follows:

The attack can have as a result only the effect of making it increasingly difficult for the United States Government to obtain the services of able scientists, the statement said. The committee asserted also that the clearance issued by the Department of Commerce after an investigation of Dr. Condon's loyalty has made it unnecessary for us to enter into a discussion of the merits of the case.

On March 20, 1948, the 3,000 members of the American Societies for Experimental Biology, consisting of five leading scientific societies—the American Physiological Society, the American Society of Biological Chemists, the American Society for Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics, the American Institute of Nutrition, the American Association of Immunologists—adopted resolutions deplored the actions and procedures of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities as inimical to the Nation's good. Typical of these resolutions was

that of the American Physiological Society which stated:

Publicity given to accusations and insinuations against the loyalty of scientists and other citizens before full collection and evaluation of the evidence not only does great personal injustice, but also defeats the very purpose for which that House committee was established; for the effect of such attacks is to discourage loyal scientists and other citizens from entering Government service, to distract and intimidate many now in service and to interfere with the effectiveness of their work.

In the city of Pittsburgh, two outstanding organizations—the Association of Pittsburgh Scientists and the Physical Society of Pittsburgh joined—in protest. The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette summarized their protest on March 5, 1948:

The Association of Pittsburgh Scientists sharply criticized the House Committee on Un-American Activities Thursday for publicly questioning the loyalty of Dr. Edward U. Condon, noted atomic scientist and head of the National Bureau of Standards.

Joining with the association, the Physical Society of Pittsburgh also verbally spanked the congressional investigating committee and asked President Truman to rebuke the House group.

Dr. R. H. McCoy, chairman of the association's executive committee and a University of Pittsburgh biochemist, added this comment: "Dr. Condon is an outstanding scientist of unquestioned loyalty." The Committee on Un-American Activities has no evidence to the contrary.

The Physical Society's message to President Truman, drafted at a meeting in the Mellon Institute Thursday night, said that as colleagues of Dr. Condon, a former president of our society, we know how absurd are the (committee's) charges.

At the annual conference of the American Society for Public Administration, Dr. Charles E. Merriam, professor emeritus of political science at the University of Chicago, denounced the "stream of bitter, smearing attacks, which do not tend either to improve the morale of the service or promote attachment to the Government. Indiscriminate baiting of public servants stands across the way of the finest type of service and the liveliest forms of allegiance to the common good. It tends to drive men away from the public service without which the Nation cannot live."

The executive committee of the Atomic Scientists of Chicago asserted on March 2, 1948, that "attacks of this nature on a distinguished scientist will increase the Government's difficulty in obtaining the services of able scientists. If, as a result of such attacks, Dr. Condon should perchance resign his directorship of the Bureau of Standards in disgust, it is unlikely that the Government could find a successor of comparable talent and standing."

Another distinguished organization, the Federation of American Scientists, according to the New York Times on March 4, 1948, accused the Committee on Un-American Activities of destroying the good name of a distinguished American physicist of demonstrated integrity and patriotism. Prof. Robert E. Marshak, who issued the statement on behalf of the federation, denounced the

subcommittee's evidence as specious and unfair to a true representative of American scientists, who during World War II played a prominent role in the development of radar and the atomic bomb, which contributed so materially to Allied victory.

These are only a few of the societies and established organizations which protested the attacks. There were many others, including church groups, legal associations, civil liberties groups, and other public-interest organizations. Meanwhile many spontaneous meetings of protest, by unorganized individuals, took place.

SPONTANEOUS MEETINGS OF PROTEST

On March 11, 1948, 200 leading scientists met in the city of New York to discuss the attacks on Dr. Condon. They unanimously adopted the following resolution:

1. Our protest arises from proceedings instituted by the so-called Thomas Committee in the case of Dr. Edward U. Condon, Chief of the Bureau of Standards of the Department of Commerce, formally cleared by the Department's loyalty board. This irresponsible attack has injured the reputation of a foremost scientist by innuendoes, rumor, and half truths. It has thereby adversely affected the national welfare by demonstrating to scientists that employment in vital scientific activities of the Government may expose them to similar intimidation and abuse.

2. Dr. Condon enjoys a reputation of such high standing among all his scientific colleagues and the general public that any suggestion of disloyalty coming from any source should be indignantly repudiated. The attack upon him illustrates the utter ignorance and the irresponsibility of the Thomas Committee.

4. We commend Secretary of Commerce Harriman's decision not to surrender the confidential documents on which the departmental loyalty board's conclusion was based.

5. The recent performances of the House Committee on Un-American Activities forces the conclusion among fair-minded people either that its irresponsible procedures should be curtailed, or failing that, the committee should be abolished as a threat to the liberties of the American people.

At this meeting Dr. Wendell Stanley, noted for his research on virus and winner of the Nobel prize, made the following statement:

It is a tragic and horrible spectacle when a group of men are engaged industriously and almost savagely in the destruction of the very thing that they shout from the housetops they are seeking to defend. Every right-thinking American favors effective and vigorous measures, especially in this time of tension, to protect the security of the Nation, whether by Congress or by other departments of Government, and most scientists are willing to work under such measures, but the methods of the Thomas committee, involving public smears and character assassinations by means of insinuation and the principle of association, do not aid the security of this Nation, for such methods will drive desperately needed scientists from Government service. The Thomas committee is actually destroying the very thing it professes to defend, and it should be abolished or its methods modified drastically. Let the administration and Congress work out the best possible security measure, and let there be an end to this public demonstration of conflict, and above all let us in this country see no more use made of the methods which have become the mark of the Thomas committee.

In these times there is a paramount need for able scientists in Government service, and we cannot afford the penalty which will result from a continuation of the methods employed by the Thomas committee in the case of Dr. Condon.

Dr. Frank B. Jewett, recently retired president of the Bell Telephone Laboratories of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., past president of the National Academy of Sciences, and one of the leading Republicans in the State of New Jersey, wired the emergency meeting:

Cannot attend Condon meeting tonight. Without regard to merits of this case, I strongly object to measures of House Committee on Un-American Activities in publicly condemning reputable American citizens without affording them opportunity to know specific charges or disloyalty and to answer same. You may record my views.

Archibald McLeish, famed writer and former Assistant Secretary of State, addressed the emergency meeting, declaring:

The action of the House of Representatives in doubling the appropriation of its Committee on Un-American Activities in the face of damaging and unanswered criticism of the committee in the press, on the floor of Congress, and among the citizens of the country, is a challenge to American opinion which will have to be met. It must be met, however, seriously and soberly and without the recourse to personal disparagement which has characterized the committee's public statements. It is not the personality of Congressman THOMAS—or the personality of Congressman RANKIN or the personality of Congressman DIES—which makes the committee an object of concern to all who know the American past and believe in the American future. It is the damaging effect of the committee's methods on American institutions and the American form of society. Specifically, it is the danger—the very real and present danger—that the committee's conduct will undermine the defenses of individual liberty in the last great stronghold of that liberty—the United States—and betray the American cause, whether knowingly or not, to its most formidable enemy.

The essential struggle of our time is obvious to all of us. It is the struggle between the police state and the citizen state, between government by terror and government under law. The reason why the American people fear Russia and detest communism is that Russia is a police state and communism, wherever communism has come to power, is government by terror. The reason why the American people believe in the United States, and trust the American form of government, is that the United States is a citizen state, and the American Government a government under law.

To maintain the citizen state against the police state, which is its present, and often successful, rival, it is essential at any cost and by every means to maintain the principle and practice of government under law. Only through government under law can the citizen be free to rule himself. The moment government by terror is substituted in any form or over any area, the wooden horse, has been introduced into the walls, and the city is in danger. Government by terror is an insidious and deadly thing. It infiltrates a society, house by house, and street after street, as the men from the wooden horse took Troy. It silences those who oppose it. It closes their mouths, either through force or fear. And in the end, as we ourselves have seen in Russia and in Bulgaria and now in Czechoslovakia and Greece and before in Italy and Germany, it has no opponents. They have disappeared. They are silent—silent or dead but in any case silent.

There are many forms, moreover, of terror: not all of them visible to the eye in automatic rifles, lengths of rubber hose and the more refined instruments of the secret police. Men can be silenced, silenced or discredited but in any case silenced, by defamation. They can be driven out of the public service, or rendered useless to the public service, not by constitutional processes and procedure, but by the publication of discreditable and unverified innuendoes about them in the press, or in that part of the press which is willing to print material of this kind. They can even be driven out of private employment by vilification and disparagement without hearing or proof and their means of livelihood destroyed. They can be disposed of, to all intents and purposes, as completely, and quite as brutally, by defamation as by force. Indeed, to the man who respects himself and his good name and the opinions of his fellow citizens, to the man of honor, that is to say, and the man of sensibility, liquidation by calumny is far more deadly than any other form of public injury.

Let there be no doubt about it—to use public vilification as an instrument of government is to use terror as an instrument of government, and to use terror as an instrument of government is to strike directly at the fundamental American institution—the liberty of the individual under law. What troubles men who have studied the Government of this Republic and who know the tradition out of which it came and who believe that the great American dream of individual liberty can even yet be realized in this world—what troubles men of this kind as they watch the conduct of the House Committee on Un-American Affairs is the growing suspicion that that committee has little understanding of the American tradition and no conception whatever of the disastrous consequences of a policy of government by disparaging publicity.

Certainly the committee has little understanding of government under law. Neither the law which shapes the legislative branch of the Government to which the committee belongs, nor the law which shapes the judicial branch, the powers of which the committee sometimes usurps, is respected in its hearings. As a committee of the legislative branch, the Thomas group exists to advise the House on legislation—which is the House's business. There is little evidence in its hearings that this duty has ever suggested itself to the committee's membership. As a committee arrogating to itself the functions of the FBI and judicial functions which the House—with limited exceptions named in the Constitution—does not possess, the committee might be expected to observe the basic safeguards of individual liberty which are respected by the American police and by American courts at all levels. These safeguards the committee does not respect. It acts regularly as prosecutor and judge, in some cases announcing its judgments even in advance of prosecutions, in articles written by committee members for popular magazines. It has denied those summoned before it the right to be confronted by their accusers, to call witnesses or to be represented by counsel. And it has taken full advantage of the parliamentary immunity of its members to deprive those whose reputations it attacks of relief through suits for libel, while at the same time spreading its allegations and innuendoes over the less self-respecting sections of the press. In brief, it has used the fiction that it is acting as a legislative committee—though it does not act as a legislative committee—to justify its failure to observe the most primitive decencies of a judicial body—which, in fact, and certainly in effect, it presumes to be.

In Washington, the Evening Star of March 20, 1948, reported that an audience of 600 persons attended a meeting

on the preceding evening, sponsored by the Washington Association of Scientists, devoted to an examination of the attacks on Dr. Condon and their implications. Dr. D. R. Inglis, professor of physics at Johns Hopkins University, addressed the group on the subject *The Present Crisis in American Science*:

I do not think it necessary for me to discuss the absurd charges which have been leveled at Dr. Condon during the last year: These ridiculous attacks have already been ably and keenly dissected by Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD in his addresses to the House of Representatives on July 22, 1947, and March 9, 1948, while editorials and radio programs like the one we have heard tonight have aptly summed the story.

There are, however, far-reaching implications to these attacks, implications of which the Nation should be aware: First, those pertaining to science and scientists and the contributions of scientists to the national welfare, and, second, those pertaining to the constitutional liberties of all citizens. As a scientist and as one who has spent his life with scientists, I propose to consider those implications with respect to science, and the crisis which public misunderstanding and abuse bring to American science.

Let us consider what these attacks mean to the Government and its enormous scientific research program at the present time. I do not think it an exaggeration to say that the very possibility of such attacks, such techniques of character assassination, such procedures of "Punishment by publicity" (as the New York Times puts it), mean that scientists and engineers are going to be very reluctant to enter Federal research agencies. This will be particularly true of the abler men.

Enormous harm in this respect has been inflicted by this one attack. Further unwarranted attacks can stifle Government research completely. Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the committee which has attacked Dr. Condon is going to be content with him as the only sacrificial lamb. On the contrary, the witch hunt might even be extended to embrace all scientists as a class. I do not believe, therefore, that even the direct implications of these attacks extend only to scientists in Government. The Government is now engaged in extensive research programs carried on under contract by universities and industry. The scientists here too will inherit the conditions imposed on those actually in Federal service; and, again, scientists will be reluctant to risk their reputations in such situations. It is only a reasonable inference that in the end even those scientists not engaged in Federal research, whether in the Government or under some contractual relationship, will be enmeshed.

The net effect will be simply this: The Government will find it impossible to attract good men for Federal work, whether the relationship is direct or indirect.

Let us, for the sake of a working hypothesis, accept the premise that short-range national security depends on military strength. That, and even more than that, is the contention of the Government; and its present policies are based on this assumption. The question then becomes: what do we mean by military strength? With each succeeding war we have seen that the percentage of our forces actually engaged in combat has decreased. Thus, in the last war only a very small portion of our total forces ever saw actual combat. At the same time, the products of science and technology have played increasingly greater roles. I need only mention radar, the proximity fuze, the atomic bomb and its role in the submarine war as recent decisive contributions of science. So it is apparent that military strength now means the applications of science and tech-

nology rather than the mere deployment of vast bodies of infantry.

Therefore, if Congress and the Government are aware of this real meaning of military strength, Congress and the Government should take prompt steps to remedy this situation which is driving and threatens to drive scientists from its service.

Very often the scientist has been looked upon as a glib, garrulous creature anxious to spill the beans: this is nonsense. Scientists recognize that security measures are inevitably necessary; what they often complain of is an unnecessary amount of such measures in those zones where it is, first, meaningless and, second, actually harmful to use.

Congress and the public must recognize that the truths of science, the laws of nature, are accessible to scientists the world over; it only requires time and diligence. Now, we can handicap our own research by insisting on such security regulations in the dissemination of information that are unrealistic. Moreover, we can hamper our application of the discoveries of research if those results are not incorporated into our technology. For these reasons, scientists have been properly zealous of the needs of the Nation in pointing out the dangers of meaningless restrictions on the dissemination of information.

The remarkable phenomenon of this period is the unwarranted suspicion of scientists. I would like to make two comments on this subject. First, the scientists have demonstrated that they know how to keep secrets. You may remember that long before the scientists were able to interest the Government in the atomic bomb, they imposed of their own accord a successful program of secrecy on their developments in this field. Nothing leaked during that period, and at last the scientists, led by two foreign refugees, convinced the President of the importance of the program, and nothing has leaked from our scientists since then either.

Second, I would like to point out that it is not only scientific matters that are important from the secrecy-of-information point of view. Since the discoveries of science can be made by scientists anywhere—and usually are in different parts of the world within short periods—the unenlightened public has been goaded into an undue apprehension over such matters. On the other hand, political decisions and secrets, whether national or international, can in principle be controlled, and these are in some ways more important. Yet very few days pass by without the disclosure—I should say leak—of some such matter from some statesman to some columnist.

One of the cardinal difficulties in the relationship of scientists to the Government and Congress lies in the fact that the latter, as well as the public, do not understand the nature of research or the methods of the scientist. These are matters that are exceedingly difficult to people without scientific training. Witness the difficulty of obtaining appropriations for Federal research—in contrast to, say, the relative ease with which the House Committee on Un-American Activities obtained a doubling of its appropriation. The latter was simple: the smearing of Dr. Condon got the committee headlines. Research is a quiet working of trained minds and its problems are difficult to formulate in one-syllable headline words; such stuff doesn't hit the headlines.

It is unfortunately easier to convince an American that a scientist is a valuable individual to have around in war than in peace. The contributions of science to war are well known. To see that science is valuable in peace, you must consider that our industrial technology is nothing more than an application of science; obvious though this is, I do not believe that Congress knows this, judging by its conduct. Most Congressmen might agree that the pure research of fifty

or a hundred years ago was a fine thing—it runs our industry today. That pure research was done because scientists then loved knowledge for its own sake.

Think of Michael Faraday, for example, one of dozens of natural philosophers of his day. Faraday was impelled by his curiosity to find out more about the strange behavior of wires with electric currents in them, with no idea that there would be electric locomotives and cities lighted by electric currents as a result of his findings. It is just as important that we let the present scientists seek knowledge for its own sake. Without that incentive, ideas important to our future material welfare would be missed.

Scientists have developed powerful intellectual procedures for seeking answers about how nature works. And they take the trouble to do it because they are curious about how nature works. They develop machines, they develop mathematical methods. But I think it is much more important that they develop a peculiar sort of imagination necessary for this thing called science and research. A man who is not curious about nature but wants only to solve a technical problem can learn about the machines or devices after they have been invented; he can learn the mathematical methods. But I believe that only a scientist curious about the secrets of nature ever develops the kind of imagination necessary to lead on into new fields of investigation with the peculiar agility that has characterized the contributions of great scientists in the past—haphazard contributions to the knowledge and happiness and comfort and scope of mankind. And, by the way, Dr. Condon is one of these rare and unusual, imaginative, and inspiring scientists.

It is possible through formal training to provide men capable of using the techniques of science and capable of talking the language of science. It may always be possible for the Government to hire enough trained men to do routine scientific work and to administer routine projects—perhaps even in spite of witch hunts. But the man who is hard to find is the man with imagination—the man who will do a superlative job leading to something new. These are the men we won't have if the smearing continues.

How is it possible to get scientists to work on developments needed by our Government? First, scientists must be developed—and this means serious attention to our educational system from the grade schools and the high schools, through the college and university levels. This must mean less emphasis on play and more incentive for hard work and really deep study, at least for some selected young people. This would provide a future supply. But how about now? How do we get first-rate mature scientists to work for the Government? Well, paying them more adequately would help some. But the best scientists cannot be merely purchased: They are too curious about the way nature works to sacrifice all scientific opportunities for research for salary alone. They must be given opportunities to do interesting research under conditions suitable for research. Perhaps this is the crux of the matter: the other factors are necessary, but even with them the lack of proper conditions dooms the Government to failure. The proper conditions include freedom from suspicion; freedom from mistrust; freedom from the insecurity that follows on the heels of slander from Congressmen interested only in headlines and forgetful of the Nation's genuine welfare.

Should we then slap the scientists down with unproved and malicious slander as soon as they attain positions of public prominence? Mr. THOMAS and his committee must learn that this is not the way to keep good scientists working for the Government. It is not the way to attract our able young men into the ranks of science for the future greatness of America. America needs the ablest

young men the country can produce, now that we can no longer count on continuing to import brilliant Europeans to fill our scientific ranks.

Consider again the objectives and policies of our Government. The present program of opposing Soviet expansion involves military developments, and these bring with them a very real problem of minimizing Soviet espionage. The problem is one that must be faced soberly and solved by genuine diligence and patience. It seems inevitable that this means some limitations on the freedom of those working on these military developments. Reasonable limitations need not interfere seriously with the work to be done nor with the quality of the worker who can be obtained. But attacks of the kind made on Dr. Condon serve only to make much more difficult the real problem. In those attacks there is no evidence; there is nothing but name-calling by innuendo and association. . . . This amounts to a sabotage of the real problem, by an unwarranted and unjustified smearing of a loyal and honored scientist. This has served to delay our Nation's military preparations, by demoralizing the bulk of our scientists—not only those in Government, but throughout the Nation. Even more important in the long run, it has served to undermine the prestige of science and will serve to destroy the quality of our scientific work and reduce general welfare in the coming years.

PROMINENT INDIVIDUALS PROTEST

Such meetings of groups as those above were typical of many throughout the Nation. Meanwhile, nationally known citizens registered their indignation publicly.

In Princeton, a group of leading scientists met and formulated their opinions in a telegram to the Secretary of Commerce on March 3, 1948:

We are profoundly disturbed by the recent charges made against Condon as reported in the press. Condon was a respected member of the department of physics here at Princeton from 1928 to 1929 and from 1930 to 1937, and we considered his departure a serious loss to our staff. Neither in that period nor in the years since have we had any reason to question his loyalty or to lower our opinion of him as a scientist or as a man. From long association with him, both personal and professional, we are convinced that he is completely loyal to the United States, and we believe that the Government is fortunate in having such an able and public-spirited physicist as Director of the Bureau of Standards. We hope that you will welcome this expression of our opinion.

Luther P. Eisenhart, Emeritus Professor of Mathematics; Henry D. Smyth, Chairman, Department of Physics; Solomon Lefschetz, Chairman, Department of Mathematics; Walker Bleakney, Professor of Physics; Rudolf W. Ladenburg, Professor of Physics; Allen G. Shenstone, Professor of Physics; Albert W. Tucker, Professor of Mathematics; John A. Wheeler, Professor of Physics; Milton G. White, Professor of Physics; Samuel S. Wilks, Professor of Mathematics; Eugene P. Wigner, Professor of Mathematical Physics.

Dr. A. N. Richards, dean of the University of Pennsylvania Medical School and president of the National Academy of Sciences, declared on March 3, 1948:

The colleagues of Dr. Condon in the National Academy of Sciences have the utmost confidence in his complete integrity and his loyalty.

Dr. L. C. Dunn, professor of zoology at Columbia University and a member of the National Academy of Sciences,

summed up his opinions on the subject in the final paragraph of a letter to the editor of the New York Times on March 3, 1948:

The conclusion to which most sensible people must come after reading of the attack on Dr. Condon is that the Committee on Un-American Activities must be restrained or abolished before it does irreparable harm not only to the reputation of a fine scientist who is serving his country well but to the whole future of science in the United States.

Dr. Walter Rautenstrauch, professor emeritus of industrial engineering at Columbia University and former vice president and general manager of the Liberty Yeast Corp., and vice president of the J. G. White Management Corp., described, on March 11, 1948, Dr. Condon as "very far from being anything but a real, loyal American. I don't think there's any conviction on the part of the Thomas committee that Condon is a subversive person," Dr. Rautenstrauch said.

In the April issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Dr. S. K. Allison, professor of physics, consultant to the National Defense Research Committee, and director of the institute for nuclear studies at the University of Chicago, wrote:

As this issue of the Bulletin goes to press, the latest denunciation by the House Committee on Un-American Activities is a leading feature of the news. A subcommittee has branded Dr. E. U. Condon, head of the National Bureau of Standards, as "one of the weakest links in our atomic security," and demanded that W. Averill Harriman, Secretary of Commerce, either call for his resignation or present a statement "setting forth the reasons" why he is kept in office. In a preliminary reply, Mr. W. C. Foster, Under Secretary of Commerce, has pointed out that only recently the loyalty board of the Department considered Dr. Condon's case and found that "no reasonable grounds exist for believing that Dr. Condon is disloyal to the Government of the United States."

The charges brought against Dr. Condon in the subcommittee's report seem to me, a layman in legal matters, to constitute defamation of character by innuendo. The report contains reckless statements such as the following one concerning the activities of Communists in this country: "They have gotten pretty far, because they got a man as Vice President of the United States, and he is now their candidate for President." This suggestion that the handful of Communists in this country planned and accomplished the election of Mr. Wallace to the Vice Presidency is more suitable to a campaign speech than a written committee report.

In the same vein, Dr. Condon by inference is accused of a crime which carries the death penalty if transmission of atomic "secrets" is involved. It is recommended that the attention of the President be called "to the fact that the situation of Dr. Condon is not an isolated one, but that there are other Government officials in strategic positions who are playing Stalin's game to the detriment of the United States."

Nothing in the evidence presented, consisting of items such as alleged association with personnel of the Polish Embassy, conferences with foreign scientists, application for a passport to visit Russia, and membership in the Rockefeller Foundation sponsored American-Soviet Friendship Society could possibly support so grave a charge, and, assuming good faith, one could only conclude that the subcommittee report was written in a state of hysterical irresponsibility.

To me, having known Dr. Condon for many years, his simple statement that the charges are untrue is sufficient. His alert and critical intelligence, his appreciation of wit and good conversation, lead him to associate with people of similar tastes, with no consideration given to social or class distinctions. All of us have recently met and enjoyed conversation and discussion with foreign scientists visiting us. In my experiences, it has been invariably true that the visitor realized that certain questions could not be answered, and carefully avoided embarrassing me by asking them.

The Japanese were amateurs at supervising the lives of their citizens. There the terror consisted in denunciation of persons for dangerous thoughts. We have, in addition, dangerous acquaintances and dangerous dinner parties.

Treason is a crime abhorrent to everyone. It is specially reprehensible in a democracy where there can be criticism of the Government by those who believe its policies are wrong, and public opposition may be conducted without fear of reprisal or question of loyalty. Charges that such a crime has been committed should not be made in the manner we are now witnessing.

Dr. Condon should obtain legal counsel and, under the law, seek what redress he may for the harm that has been done him.

The attacks on Dr. Condon were recognized by distinguished Americans as long ago as last year. Six of the Nation's best-known leaders in science—four of them winners of the coveted Nobel prize—protested to the New York Times and to Science, official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, which has a membership of approximately 50,000. These, Dr. Irving Langmuir, associate director of the General Electric Corp.'s Research Laboratories; Dr. Wendell M. Stanley and Dr. Duncan MacInnes, of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research; Dr. I. I. Rabi and Dr. George B. Pegram, of Columbia University; and Dr. Harold C. Urey, of the University of Chicago, wrote:

We wish to register a protest against two recent articles by Representative J. PARNELL THOMAS, of New Jersey, chairman of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities. These are: Russia Grabs Our Inventions (American Magazine, June) and Reds in Our Atom Plants (Liberty, June 21).

Mr. THOMAS' articles are inaccurate to the point of absurdity. Thus, in one, he says that the National Bureau of Standards tests patents, which will be news to the Bureau and the Patent Office. Nevertheless, his attacks on the patriotism and honesty of American scientists are bound to be taken seriously by many people and will do harm.

We are particularly aroused at the treatment accorded Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the Bureau of Standards, who, by inference and innuendo, is made to appear engaged in reprehensible and subversive activities.

Dr. Condon is a distinguished scientist, the director of a great national institution, a former president of the American Physical Society, sometimes adviser to the Senate on matters concerning atomic energy, and a former associate director of the Westinghouse laboratories. By no stretch of the imagination is he a Communist or an unloyal American.

Mr. THOMAS especially attacks Dr. Condon for his membership on the board of directors of the American-Soviet Science Society. This organization, which has received a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation, is in no way connected with any pro-Soviet agency. It exists solely for the purpose of furthering international exchange of sci-

tific information (something scientists everywhere favor), particularly by making Russian scientific papers available in English.

Mr. THOMAS furthermore plainly implies that Dr. Condon is dodging testifying before the Thomas committee. Dr. Condon, however, can hardly be an unwilling witness, since he has never been invited to testify, although he was visited in March by two of the committee's investigators, with whom he cooperated completely.

One of the most distinguished and famed Americans, a scientist, an engineer, a business executive, and a prominent Republican, is Dr. Frank B. Jewett. It is worth noting some of the positions which Dr. Jewett has held in his long and brilliant career in American science, business, and engineering:

Transmission engineer, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 1904-12.

Assistant chief engineer, Western Electric Co., 1912-16.

Chief engineer, Western Electric Co., 1916-21.

Vice president and chief engineer, Western Electric Co., 1921-22.

Vice president, Western Electric Co., 1922-25.

Vice president in charge of development research, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 1925 until his recent retirement.

President of the Bell Telephone Laboratories of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 1925-40.

Chairman of the board, Bell Telephone Laboratories, 1940 to the present.

Vice chairman of the Engineering Foundation, 1921-25.

Chairman, Division of Engineering and Industrial Research, National Research Council, 1923-27.

Member, National Defense Research Committee, Office of Scientific Research and Development, 1941-47.

Trustee, Carnegie Institution.

Trustee, Princeton University.

Member of the Corporation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

President, National Academy of Sciences, 1939-47.

I will not add other positions, nor will I mention awards and distinctions that have been conferred upon him. As long ago as last June 24, 1947, shortly after two articles by Congressman THOMAS appeared in popular magazines, attacking Dr. Condon, Dr. Jewett took cognizance of the situation and recognized not only the injustice to Dr. Condon but the grave implications to science and the national welfare. On June 24, 1947, Dr. Jewett wrote to a prominent fellow-Republican of New Jersey in the following vein, referring to Congressman THOMAS' articles:

While I know that no one can restrain Members of Congress from writing what they wish, I think it high time that some of you in the New Jersey Republican high command let Thomas know that articles like these are harmful and do neither the Nation nor the Republican Party, and particularly those of us here in New Jersey, any good. They are in the pattern of the worst that the Dies committee members put out.

Referring to Dr. Condon, Dr. Jewett said, in this letter:

By no stretch of the imagination is he a Communist or an unloyal American and yet THOMAS had used his position to make it

appear that there is something hidden and reprehensible in what Condon has done and is doing.

Dr. Jewett concluded:

I have written you thus at length merely with the thought that you and others of our New Jersey Republican command should know that some of us good GOP boys disapprove strongly of the type of publicity Thomas is emitting.

I have already included, earlier, Dr. Jewett's recent comments on the March 1, 1948, attacks on Dr. Condon. On March 11, 1948, Dr. Jewett, sensitive to the destructive implications of the attacks on the future of science and government, addressed a statement on Scientists in Government at Work to the editor of the New York Times:

An experience of 8 years as president of the National Academy of Sciences and as a member of the National Defense Research Committee throughout its life makes me conscious of the difficulty of getting many of our ablest scientists to undertake work for the Government under the best of conditions and enables me to confirm the opinion expressed in your editorial of March 8 on the Condon case.

In wartime scientists will volunteer, as all good citizens will, and put up with necessary restraints and irritations. In peacetime, however, the conditions of Government service are not attractive to many if not most of our ablest scientists. The restraints on freedom of operation and the petty annoyances of bureaucracy are repugnant to them. Hence they are not attracted by Government service, even though they know that the problems presented for solution are important.

If to these normal drawbacks is added the constant threat of being publicly pilloried as traitors without opportunity to learn the specific charges made against them and to have their day in court in a public hearing, scientists would be less than human if they declined to assume the risk. Those of us who spend a lifetime in science know the extent and intensity of this feeling and the price the Nation will pay if the feeling persists.

Irrespective of the outcome of the charges which, without giving him an opportunity to defend himself, have been made against Dr. Condon, it is high time that Mr. THOMAS and his associates changed their methods. Even if the promptings of common decency did not bring about a change there is a very practical reason why they should, and the reason is that they are endangering the safety of the Nation at a crucial moment in history.

Still another indication of the reaction of the Nation is the dinner held on April 12, at the Biltmore Hotel in New York City, by scientists from every part of the Nation as an expression of confidence in Dr. Condon. Dr. Harold C. Urey, professor of chemistry at the University of Chicago, Nobel prize winner, and chairman of the dinner committee, had this to say of the attacks on Dr. Condon in announcing the dinner:

The undocumented and irresponsible attacks made by the House Committee on Un-American Activities on Dr. Edward U. Condon, Chief of the United States Bureau of Standards, have disgusted all fair-minded Americans. Conservatives and liberals alike have united in condemning the methods of Congressman THOMAS and his associates, who have it in their power to destroy the reputation of any citizen by vague insinuations.

The scientific community has reason to feel a special sense of outrage at the unwarranted attacks on the loyalty of our colleague. Many of us who have been closely associated with Dr. Condon over a long period—during his years of university teaching, his associate directorship of the Westinghouse research laboratory, and especially his period of invaluable service to his country on the Manhattan District project—have good reason to place full confidence in his complete integrity and loyalty to American institutions.

The sponsors—123 in number—represent a veritable galaxy of scientific stars, Nobel prize winners, heads of departments in leading universities, presidents of universities, national leaders in almost every field of the sciences. The sponsors are:

Dr. S. K. Allison, University of Chicago.
 Carl D. Anderson, California Institute of Technology.
 Kenneth T. Bainbridge, Harvard University.
 E. T. Bell, California Institute of Technology.
 Hans A. Bethe, Cornell University.
 Raymond T. Birge, University of California.
 Francis Bitter, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 Lyle Borst, Brookhaven National Laboratory.
 Gregory Breit, Yale University.
 F. G. Brickwedde, National Bureau of Standards.
 P. W. Bridgman, Harvard University.
 Harrison Brown, University of Chicago.
 Perry Byerly, University of California.
 A. J. Carlson, University of Chicago.
 Robert F. Christy, California Institute of Technology.
 Karl T. Compton, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 Richard Courant, New York University.
 Wheeler P. Daved, Pennsylvania State University.
 Peter J. W. Debye, Cornell University.
 Milislav Demerec, Carnegie Institute of Washington.
 David M. Dennison, University of Michigan.
 Theodosius Dobzhansky, Columbia University.
 L. C. Dunn, Columbia University.
 Vincent du Bigneaud, Cornell University.
 Albert Einstein, Institute for Advanced Study.
 Paul S. Epstein, California Institute of Technology.
 R. D. Evans, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
 James Franck, University of Chicago.
 W. H. Furry, Harvard University.
 Paul Gross, Duke University.
 R. G. Gustavson, University of Nebraska.
 W. D. Harkins, University of Chicago.
 Ross G. Harrison, Yale University.
 William Havens, Columbia University.
 Michael Heidelberger, Columbia University.
 Karl F. Herzfeld, Catholic University.
 W. A. Higinbotham, Brookhaven National Laboratory.
 Joel H. Hildebrand, University of California.

Thorfin R. Hogness, University of Chicago.

Ernest A. Hooton, Harvard University.
 J. C. Hunsaker, Massachusetts Institute of Technology and chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

D. R. Inglis, Johns Hopkins University.
 Edwin C. Kemble, Harvard University.
 Earle H. Kennard, Cornell University.
 M. S. Kharasch, University of Chicago.
 John G. Kirkwood, Cornell University.
 P. Gerald Kurger, University of Illinois.
 K. S. Lashley, Yerkes Laboratories.
 Charles C. Lauritsen, California Institute of Technology.

Andrew C. Lawson, University of California.

Solomon Lefschetz, Princeton University.

Leo Loeb, Washington University.
 Ralph Linton, Columbia University.

M. S. Livingston, Brookhaven National Laboratory.

F. W. Loomis, University of Illinois.
 Irving Lowen, New York University.

Robert H. Lowie, University of California.

Duncan A. MacInnes, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

Julian Mack, University of Wisconsin.
 Henry Margenau, Yale University.

Robert Marshak, University of Rochester.

Joseph E. Mayer, University of Chicago.

Richard L. Meier, Federation of American Scientists.

K. F. Meyer, University of California.
 Leonor Michaelis, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research.

Alan C. G. Mitchell, University of Indiana.

Philip Morrison, Cornell University.
 H. Marston Morse, Institute for Advanced Study.

Philip Morse, Brookhaven National Laboratory.

F. R. Moulton, Smithsonian Institute.
 H. J. Muller, University of Indiana.

Robert S. Mulliken, University of Chicago.

F. D. Murnaghan, Johns Hopkins University.

Harold H. Nielsen, Ohio State University.

W. Albert Noyes, Jr., University of Rochester.

Linus Pauling, California Institute of Technology.

Ernest Pollard, Yale University.

Daniel Q. Posin, North Dakota State Agricultural College.

James Rainwater, Columbia University.

H. M. Randall, University of Michigan.

William Barita, Brooklyn College.

M. M. Rhoades, Columbia University.
 W. H. Rodenbush, University of Illinois.

Vladimir Rojansky, Union College.

Henry Morris Russell, Princeton University.

Edward O. Salant, Brookhaven National Laboratory.

R. A. Sawyer, University of Michigan.
 George Scatchard, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

G. T. Seaborg, University of California.

Frederick Seitz, Carnegie Institute of Technology.

Henry Semat, College of the City of New York.

Robert Serber, University of California.

Harlow Shapley, Harvard University.
 John C. Slater, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Homer W. Smith, New York University.

Lloyd P. Smith, Cornell University.

Tracy M. Sonneborn, Indiana University.

Otto Stern, University of California.

Otto Struve, Yerkes Observatory.
 Richard M. Sutton, Haverford College.

Leo Szilard, University of Chicago.

Edward Teller, University of Chicago.
 Edward L. Thorndike, Columbia University.

M. A. Tuve, Carnegie Institute of Washington.

Harold C. Urey, University of Chicago.
 C. B. Van Niel, Stanford University.

J. H. Van Vleck, Harvard University.
 Oswald Veblen, The Institute for Advanced Study.

Selman A. Waksman, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station.

William W. Watson, Yale University.

D. L. Webster, Stanford University.

Victor S. Weisskopf, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Herman Weyl, Institute for Advanced Study.

George H. Whipple, University of Rochester.

J. B. Whitehead, Johns Hopkins University.

Eugene P. Wigner, Princeton University.

L. A. Wills, College of the City of New York.

R. R. Wilson, Cornell University.

Hugh C. Wolfe, College of the City of New York.

Jerrold Zacharias, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Oscar Zariski, Harvard University.

M. W. Zemansky, College of the City of New York.

Clarence Zener, University of Chicago.

These illustrations of the reaction of important organizations, groups, and individuals to the unwarranted and unfair attacks on Dr. E. U. Condon are merely representative. Neither time nor space permit the presentation of the full response. Startling though this response is, it is even more significant, for this is a period when we are all seriously concerned with grave national and international issues. In spite of these issues, the best minds of the Nation were so outraged at the attacks that they have reacted—and reacted in no uncertain terms.

Those distinguished Americans who know Dr. Condon—and there are many hundreds of these—have left no doubt about their knowledge of the integrity, the loyalty, the utter reliability, and dependability of this famed scientist, whom *Fortune* ranked as one of the 10 scientists of top rank which this Nation has developed in 200 years.

Both those who know Dr. Condon and those who do not, have left no doubt about their grave concern over the tac-

tics and procedures of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

All have realized the appalling significance of these tactics and attacks in terms of the future of the progress of science in this country, in terms of the future of the relation of scientists to the Government, in terms of the future of the national security and welfare which rest on uninterrupted progress in science.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 45 I am not recorded because I was absent from the Chamber on official business. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 45 I am not recorded because I was absent from the chamber on official business. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 45 I am not recorded because I was absent from the chamber on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REPORT ON BOGOTA

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, to begin with, may I say that never has this great chamber looked as welcome to my eyes as it does at the present moment, nor has the warm feeling I hold for the Members of this body ever seemed quite as cordial. The old adage that "Absence makes the heart grow fonder" is most certainly applicable in the present instance.

Scarcely more than 2 weeks ago, I left Washington as your observer for the Ninth Conference of American States at Bogota, Colombia. Here it was hoped to draft an organic pact in cooperation with the other American Republics, a pact which would act as a guide post in our future relations with each other. The conference was to climax many previous discussions which had contributed so much to a better understanding between the countries in this hemisphere. It was to be a pact within the framework of the United Nations and was intended to lend an added measure of strength and stability to our relationships, not only with Latin-America, but with all of the other countries of the earth.

The opening sessions of the conference were disposed of without untoward incidents, and agreement was early reached which assigned the delegation members to six committees, the duties of which were clearly set forth and whose functions were designed to facilitate consideration of the many questions of mutual self-interest, the resolution of which might contribute to a peaceful and prosperous hemisphere. There was no thought expressed in any United States delegation meeting which I attended, and I was present at most of them, that might have been interpreted by anyone as representing selfish interest on the part of the United States or which could conceivably indicate anything resembling a design for hemispheric imperialism.

Yet the same forces of obstruction—the agents of world chaos—the planners of a world proletariat state—the international Communists, whose god is Lenin and whose prophet is Stalin, were determined that this new move in the direction of world order and stability must be blocked at any cost. Sound economies, public order, juridical processes, constitutional forms, and the expressions of majority opinion have always been and will ever continue to be the greatest road blocks on the path to a Red world.

The Colombian Communist, like his counterpart here in America and in every land, owes no loyalty to his native soil. His only allegiance is paid to the Kremlin, and he has long since lost the habit of original thought. He parrots his Marxian philosophy like a ventriloquist's dummy, and his devotion to civil liberties is a touching thing to behold—until he obtains the whip hand. He is an agent of a police state such as the world has never seen, and his hatred of property and those who hold it is second only to his desire to personally acquire something for nothing. Lacking shoes, he detests those who wear them, and his ideology leads him to set the torch to the shoe factory in order that his innate inferiority complex may better be disguised in a shoeless world. The cold fact that he has never tried to earn a pair of shoes, a suit of clothes, an automobile, or a home never infringes upon a mentality better suited to looting, rapacity, and murder.

The rise of communism offered an international sanctuary for the mass diseased minds of the earth. The international paranoics, under the cloak of humanity long ago set forth to chart a course of world conquest. Using the tools of fear, famine, and disease, these parasites on the social body early discovered that any promise, made often enough and fervently enough would serve to list recruits for any cause, and there were many people ready to listen at the beginning. Peasants who had toiled on feudal land for centuries were happy to rid themselves of landlords, who had demanded 50 percent of all the crops they raised. However, the tumult of joy subsided quickly under the new masters when from 65 percent to 80 percent of the annual crops disappeared down the red maw of the new master.

But Colombia is a peaceful land. For many years the sounds of war had not been heard. Two generations of Colombians had grown up in an era of tranquillity. Some of the governments were good, some were bad, but none had been so corrupt as to render it necessary to bring it down with the sword.

There was a general dissatisfaction with the government of Ospina Perez, the conservative. The Liberal Party, and it should here be emphasized that the Liberal Party is by no means an agent of communism in Colombia, was determined to change the administration. There is nothing to indicate that the party, as such, had in mind any other course of action than that provided constitutionally. But when one considers courses of action in a world such as ours today, he must also consider whether or

not he will be master of the situation when he embarks upon his project. One finds strange bedfellows in world politics today.

So it was with Colombia. I hold no brief for or against the Perez government. Although unpopular with many thousands of Colombians, it had been duly elected and constitutionally installed. Neither do I feel that the Liberal Party sanctions or endorses the actions of the mobs under their anarchist leaders.

But the fact remains that the Red tide last week touched the shores of the Western Hemisphere, and with the sword and torch the agents of international aggression have laid waste a capital city of one of the American Republics. For the first time organized Red leadership has bared its teeth in an expression of riot, pillage, and slaughter that cannot go unnoticed by the other nations whose interest and independence have been so vitally affected by the uprising at Bogota, Colombia, on the afternoon of Friday, April 9.

Whether or not the assassination of the Liberal leader and idol, Jorge Gaitán, was an act of the Communists, a disgruntled Liberal, or the Conservative administration itself will probably never be known, so rapid was the action by which the assassin was hauled through milling mobs and lynched within the sight of thousands. But, sincere patriot or paid hireling, the lips that might have told the world of the true story of his motivation or his purpose have been sealed forever. It is enough to know that the shots fired by his hand not only gave the signal for one of the most violent uprisings in the history of the Western Hemisphere, but, what is more important, gave the United States and the other Republics of the Continent a close-up view of what any country can expect in the face of organized mob violence.

The proportion of Communists and Communist sympathizers in the mad-dened throngs which for 3 days looted and burned their own national institutions and facilities in Colombia, probably did not exceed 5 percent of the population, but under the prodding and harangues of the Red leaders, they lost their sense of direction and purpose, and turned from a possibly legitimate expression of national dissatisfaction with the Conservative government to violence, bloodshed, arson, and looting. Grief for the untimely death of Gaitán turned in a single hour to unrestricted mob violence, which spared neither shop, church, public utility or institution of public service. Inflamed by initial success the mobs milled in the streets, armed with whatever weapons they could obtain, smashing windows and doors, overturning streetcars and busses, looting shops, markets, and stores, and then setting the torch to the shambles remaining. What could be carried was taken, what could not be lifted was smashed. Bolts of textiles were carried into the streets to be hauled their entire lengths through the gutters. Wanton and useless destruction was the order of the day.

Foreigners sought refuge where they could find it, and it must be said that many found their sanctuary under the

roofs of the sincere and hospitable Colombian people, upon whom the shame of these hours will long lay as a heavy blight. Nor was the open repugnance at the action of the mobs restricted to the upper or small middle class. It is shared by thousands and thousands of ordinary Colombian men and women, men and women who work for low wages and for long hours but in whom love of God, country, and human decency are inherent. All of us who were in Bogota during the first few hours of the uprising were struck by the loyalty of the men and women who served in the most menial positions, but who had come to look upon us as friends and guests within their country. I can best illustrate this point by referring to our flight from the capital building, which was the first of the national structures to feel the impact of the mobs bent on destruction.

The national capital of Colombia, like the building in which this Congress sits, is a beautiful structure. Its parquet floors, its great chandeliers, its ceiling-high mirrors, and the extreme good taste of its furnishing would have done justice to a much greater state than Colombia. The nation had spared no expense in making what it considered suitable preparations for the Ninth Conference of American states. Modern translation equipment was installed and the complete building was refinished and repaired for what was to be a great and satisfying moment in the history of the country, that moment in which a free and independent Colombia would play proud host to her sister republics. Bedecked with the flags of the conference, the capitol was a sight of splendor dominating the open square on which it faces. Flanked by a magnificent cathedral on one side and shops and stores on the other two sides, the Plaza, during the first days of the conference, gave little indication of the bloody rioting that was to center around its fountains within such a short few days.

On Friday last your observer, together with three other members of the United States delegation was having lunch in the fine restaurant located in the Capitol basement. Gaitán was murdered shortly after 1 p. m. on Friday and within minutes the mobs were surging through the Plaza. The unarmed police were powerless to cope with the situation and were brushed aside by the rioters as they streamed into the building. Red flags were in profusion and I personally saw hammer-and-sickle flags. Using stones, bricks, machetes, and boards, the mob commenced a methodical tour of destruction which was to render the first floor of the capitol building a shambles within a matter of minutes. The police reorganized and in a short while managed to eject the rioters from the building. Delegates were herded to the upper floors and were told that they would be evacuated by army convoy within an hour.

In the meanwhile, the surging mobs turned their attention to automobiles, streetcars, and buses in the Plaza square and within 2 hours after the initial outbreak much of Bogota's transportation was in flames, and the columns of black

smoke which were to characterize this city for the next 3 days were rolling skyward. In every group there appeared to be a leader with a plan. Orators harangued the mobs and the most frequently heard phrase was "Abajo," which means "down with." After the first few senseless minutes of apparent confusion, the movement gained added impetus and a new sense of organization. Looting broke out and the first fires in the business district were started. Firing, which was rare in the first several hours became more general as night approached.

Considering that another attack on the Capitol was likely four of us decided on an attempt to reach our hotel at about 3:30 p. m. The crowds were concentrated in the front of the Capitol, so we left by the back street. We passed through a great many groups being harangued by speakers. One of our number, Edward Hidalgo, who speaks fluent Spanish interpreted some of the phrases overheard in passing. They consisted principally of "imperialism," "arise workers," and the usual Communist patter familiar to the members of this body.

What might have occurred had we not come upon a friendly Colombian is difficult to state. In any event, he exposed himself to no little danger in offering us the use of his ancient car which was one of the very few to be seen intact on Bogota streets last Friday. By a circuitous route through the looting and ugly crowds he finally brought us to our hotel where we found a number of other members of the United States delegation.

Friday night found the United States group isolated in three principal locations, although some few others were elsewhere in the city. At the United States Embassy approximately 65 persons under the direction of Assistant Secretary of State Norman Armour, were completely isolated from the American delegation headquarters group directly across the street in the Edificio Americano. The delegation members were headed by Mr. Paul Daniels, Chief of American Republic Affairs in the Department of State. Secretary Marshall and others of the United States group were isolated in their residences elsewhere in the city.

Communications on Friday night, save for the radio in the Embassy building, were nonexistent. Fires almost completely circled the two buildings and a small blaze in the basement of the Embassy building was taken under control before it could seriously damage the structure. There was no food available for the Americans in either building, although others of us at the delegation hotel were more fortunate in this respect. During Friday night a crude bomb was thrown into the United States delegation headquarters, but no casualties resulted.

I feel that I would be remiss in my duty as your observer if I did not mention at this point the courage and high morale of all of the United States delegation members during the entire course of the uprising. Thousands of miles from home, with flame on three sides, with looting and marauding mobs howling through the streets, the courage and

devotion to duty of the United States group was an inspiration to all who witnessed the tragedy at Bogota.

Not one American was armed and constant attempts were made by the rioters to enter any and all buildings. In spite of this continuous turmoil on Friday night, the personnel remained orderly and calm and did whatever they could to help facilitate the general welfare.

Frequently we are prone to criticize the work of those who serve us abroad in the various delegations or the Foreign Service. I think I know something of war, and I believe that these were excellent United States soldiers on a dangerous assignment if any ever were.

Later, when evacuations commenced, it was found necessary to order some of the personnel to leave their post of duty to return to Panama and the United States. I, for one, am proud and happy to have gone through the Bogota tragedy with the men and women who comprised our task force at the Conference. They are splendid Americans and all should know of their labors and their courage.

Upon orders of Secretary of State Marshall, evacuations of all but vitally needed personnel commenced on Saturday. Communications were still out of order, but armed convoys were able to move from place to place under heavy sniper fire. A high priority for evacuations was assigned to delegates from all republics and many other men, women, and children of the Latin-American countries were flown out of Bogota by the Twentieth Troop Transport Command, based in Panama. Incoming planes carried rations in case of food shortages, and assurances were given all delegations that such rations would be made available to them as needed.

What then, Mr. Speaker, are the portents for America? What relation does an uprising in such a remote and inaccessible place as Bogota mean in terms of the future welfare and security of the United States? To me, the implications are clear. The uprising in Colombia is not something that just happened, a chance meeting place for opposing forces in basic conflict with each other. The events of the past week, Mr. Speaker, are but additional stitches in the cloth of violence, which will, when completed, represent the triumph of brute force over law and freedom.

What has happened in Bogota can and will happen again in such places as New York City, Chicago, and San Francisco unless we, who still remain free and unfettered gird ourselves for all-out battle with the enemy. This is war as truly as if we were opposed by armed might and a physical enemy. What is more, it is not an enemy who shows quarter to the vanquished or mercy to the noncombatants. It is a foe unlike any monstrosity produced in all history, an adversary to whom any means justify the end.

This body is presently considering legislation to cope with the tragedy of atheistic communism. It is my fervent hope, and I know that this hope is shared by millions of people throughout this country, that the finished measure will bear as many fangs as the creature with

which we have to contend; that it will match blow for blow and lash for lash; that it will guarantee at least one place on the face of the earth where a man can walk upright in human dignity and freedom without fear of the sword, the scourge, or the lash.

There can be no peace in a world divided between these two basic philosophies, and he who contends that there can be speaks out of the sheerest folly or the deepest malice. We could not do business with Hitler and we cannot do business with Stalin. The basic concepts of America with respect to the fundamental rights of man are entirely and completely incompatible with any police state order, no matter how disguised by its apologists and its advocates.

Colombia is a milepost on the road of aggression. Its warning is clear to all who witnessed the violence and the bloodshed in Colombia. It will be followed by other warnings, whose meanings will not lend themselves to misinterpretation. The clamor, the tumult and the shouting will doubtless continue in the Kremlin, on the sad streets and boulevards of an enslaved world, yes Mr. Speaker, here on the floor of this House. There will be those who will proclaim the sins of omission and commission perpetrated by Wall Street bankers, imperialists and all the rest of the nauseous tommyrot with which our ears are daily filled by the front organizations, and the Communist world press. In the meanwhile, force, brutal and undisguised will continue to ride roughshod over the home, the church, and the popular will.

Fortunately, sound counsel from liberals and conservatives alike appears to prevail for the moment in the Colombian Government. The delegations, proceeding again to their work, have received guaranties of sufficient physical protection to permit the resumption of the discussions. Although foiled temporarily in their efforts to seize the nation for their own purpose, there is no guaranty that the Communist agents will not make early and renewed efforts to seize power—not in the name of the Colombian people, but in the name of bloodshed and carnage.

It is an hour of moment for the United States. It is the hour of decision. To block the Communists in their quest for power here at home may conceivably infringe upon some small measure of the individual rights of those who are not themselves Communists, but whose actions lend every aid and comfort to the enemy. In the interest of the vast majority of the American people this becomes our solemn and sworn duty. If there is one thing certain it is the fact that failing to take action in the near future will mean the permanent loss of an even greater number of our own American rights.

It is better and easier to retain liberty than it will be to regain it, once lost.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4326) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898,

and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "1948" and insert "1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, and I presume again today, the Member from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] proceeded to malign the Committee on Un-American Activities and to put in the RECORD attacks on the chairman of that committee that should be stricken from the RECORD, and to quote from various papers over the Nation statements on a subject with which they are not familiar, attacking the committee because of the so-called Condon case.

I was not on the subcommittee that handled that case in the beginning. But I know something of the facts in the case.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI, a great and patriotic American, wrote a three-page letter on this Condon case, and the Committee on Un-American Activities has asked to see that letter.

Because of our request, and because of the information the Committee on Un-American Activities has uncovered this campaign of malicious attacks on the Committee on un-American Activities is being carried on.

The atomic bomb is the most dangerous weapon the world has ever known. A few of them would almost destroy America if properly placed. This committee has some information which we propose for the House to have. All we are asking now is that this letter be submitted to a committee of the House of Representatives.

I submit that no head of a department has the right to pull down an iron curtain between the Congress and those individuals on the Federal pay roll whom we have a right to investigate.

I have no ax to grind in this matter. I have said time and again on this floor that my country comes first. If it were not for the serious questions that are involved I would not serve on this committee for another day. But I realize we are confronted with some of the most serious problems that have ever come before the Congress of the United States. Some of those questions are going to be brought to a vote to the floor of the House within the next week or 10 days.

The Committee on un-American Activities is doing its best to protect this country from the enemies within our gates and I protest against these vicious attacks on the committee by a Member whose record has been one of open antagonism toward that committee from the very beginning.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Waterbury American.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2195. An act to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2038. An act to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct research on foot-and-mouth disease and other diseases of animals and to amend the act of May 29, 1884 (23 Stat. 31), as amended, by adding another section.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 358. An act for relief of Hilario A. Goltia;

H. R. 387. An act for relief of Hayato Harris Ozawa;

H. R. 388. An act for relief of Bert Harrington, Jr.;

H. R. 420. An act for relief of Esther Ringel;

H. R. 421. An act for relief of Betty Isabel Schunke;

H. R. 560. An act for relief of Wilhemina Piper Enz;

H. R. 899. An act for relief of Mrs. Keum Nyu Park;

H. R. 927. An act for relief of the estate of Mary D. Briggs, deceased;

H. R. 990. An act for relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1859. An act for relief of Philip Lee Sjoerd Huizenga;

H. R. 1912. An act for relief of John A. Dilboy;

H. R. 1927. An act for relief of Margaret Katherine Hume;

H. R. 2213. An act for relief of A. J. Sprouffske;

H. R. 2250. An act for relief of Mrs. Daisy A. T. Jaegers;

H. R. 2303. An act for relief of Mitsu M. Kobayashi;

H. R. 2425. An act for relief of August Dane Tetuacaro;

H. R. 2427. An act for relief of Jose Cabral Lorenzo;

H. R. 2557. An act for relief of Mable Gladys Vidulich;

H. R. 2633. An act for relief of Claude T. Thomas, and others;

H. R. 2645. An act to provide that appointments of United States commissioners in certain national parks shall be made by

United States district courts without recommendation and approval of Secretary of Interior;

H. R. 3039. An act for relief of Mrs. Marian D. McC. Plein;

H. R. 3300. An act for relief of Martin King;

H. R. 3387. An act for relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.;

H. R. 3263. An act for relief of Tech. Sgt. Tsuyoshi Matsumoto;

H. R. 3484. An act to transfer the Remount Service from the Department of the Army to the Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 3569. An act to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y.;

H. R. 3849. An act for relief of Domingo Gandarias;

H. R. 3968. An act for relief of Olive Irene Milloglav;

H. R. 4118. An act to confirm title in fee simple in Thomas Loflin to certain lands in Rankin County, Miss.;

H. R. 4403. An act for relief of Ladislao Vaida and others;

H. R. 4572. An act to amend section 7 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act of 1925;

H. R. 4636. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, as amended;

H. R. 4649. An act to provide that compensation of members of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923;

H. R. 4739. An act to amend paragraph 1629 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to provide for the free importation of exposed X-ray film;

H. R. 5328. An act to amend paragraph 1803 (2) of the Tariff Act of 1930, relating to firewood and other woods; and

H. R. 5387. An act for relief of certain officers and employees of the Department of the Treasury.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, April 19, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1468. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the quarterly report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 from January 1 through March 31, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1469. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation and a supplemental estimate for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of \$268,000,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 614); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. Senate Joint Resolution 207. Joint resolution to provide for the com-

memoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the establishment of the Department of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1742). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 1545. An act to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures, across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 1611. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Sauk Rapids, Minn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1745). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5543. A bill granting the consent of Congress to Carolina Power & Light Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a dam in the Lumber River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6188. A bill to confer jurisdiction over the Fort Des Moines Veterans' Village upon the State of Iowa; without amendment (Rept. No. 1747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6223. A bill to provide for the construction of shore protective works at the town of Nome, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 1748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5298. A bill to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3239. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3915. A bill to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1751). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6224. A bill for the relief of John Watkins; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1743). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:
H. R. 6258. A bill to tax the profits out of war by steeply graduated income and other taxes in order to provide for an effective national defense, to promote peace, to encourage actual neutrality, to discourage war profiteering, to distribute the burdens of war,

to keep democracy alive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOESER:

H. R. 6259. A bill relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELSAESSER:

H. R. 6260. A bill to review reports on the Buffalo, N. Y., harbor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 6261. A bill to provide for the Adm. David Glasgow Farragut Birthplace National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 6262. A bill to prevent profiteering in time of war and to equalize the burdens of war and thus provide for the national defense and promote peace; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6263. A bill to provide a Federal charter for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and for other purposes to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6264. A bill to provide reduced annuities at age 55 after 5 years of civilian service for persons involuntarily separated from the Federal service not by removal for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. J. Res. 374. Joint resolution to increase the sum authorized to be appropriated for the presentation to Elre of a statue of Commodore John Barry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. J. Res. 375. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim an annual National Rededication to Marriage Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 376. Joint resolution providing for closer cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 377. Joint resolution to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to strengthen the American merchant marine, to encourage investment in the American merchant marine, to build more ships, and to remove inequities; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. Res. 539. Resolution providing for the payment to Ella J. Ickes, widow of William G. Ickes, late employee of the House, 6 months' salary and \$250 funeral expenses; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 543. Resolution providing for printing additional 25,000 copies of Fascism in Action; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MacKINNON:

H. R. 6265. A bill for the relief of Adolphson, Huseeth, Laysen & Welch, a partnership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6266. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Adam Szafr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1783. By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Kent County, Del., containing 400 signa-

tures, requesting passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1784. By Mr. GOFF: Petition of Mrs. F. O. Brocke and 105 others, urging passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1785. By Mr. HART: Petition of the American Legion, Department of New Jersey, expressing opposition to any reduction or curtailment of services or benefits to veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1786. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition signed by Mrs. Ethel Ayers and 49 other citizens of Corvallis, Oreg., endorsing a system of universal military training, as recommended by the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1787. By the SPEAKER: Petition of W. A. Naurman, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1788. Also, petition of F. A. Winchell, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1789. Also, petition of Mrs. F. A. Winchell, Miami, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1790. Also, petition of Mrs. G. E. Knapp, Orio Vista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1791. Also, petition of Pfc. W. C. Farrell, APO 169, care of Postmaster, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to endorsement of universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, March 29, 1948)

The Senate met at 11:30 a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Clarence W. Cranford, pastor of the Calvary Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

We cannot enter this room, our Father, without realizing that the lives of millions of people are affected by the decisions that are made here. If ever anyone needed divine guidance, surely it is those who have the responsibility of leading America in these critical days of the world's history. Seeing, therefore, that they are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses around the world, help these who are the lawmakers of our land to face with patience the tasks that are set before them, looking unto Thee for inspiration and guidance. And may the reward of their labors be a peaceful world. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

XCIV—288

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 15, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] be granted leave to be absent from the Senate through Wednesday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6226) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3703. An act to authorize transfer of surplus real property to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for consolidation of Federal holdings within areas administered by the National Park Service; and

H. R. 4326. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

ORDER FOR RECESS TO NOON TUESDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business for today it take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATION OF FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF LIBERATION OF CUBA—JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the benefit of the Senate. Under House Concurrent Resolution 184, the Senate will go to the Hall of the House of Representatives where a joint session of the two Houses will be held in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba. It is the intention that the Senate shall proceed to the Hall of the House in a body and shall return to the Senate Chamber and reassemble immediately after the ceremonies are concluded.

After the Senate reassembles, there will be an opportunity for Senators to make insertions in the Record and for any other business the Senate may desire to transact.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Butler
Baldwin	Bridges	Byrd
Ball	Brooks	Cain
Barkley	Buck	Capehart
Brewster	Bushfield	Capper

Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Cordon	Kem	Reed
Donnell	Kilgore	Revercomb
Downey	Knowland	Robertson, Va.
Dworschak	Langer	Robertson, Wyo.
Eastland	Lodge	Russell
Eaton	Lucas	Saltonstall
Ellender	McCarran	Stennis
Ferguson	McCarthy	Stewart
Flanders	McClellan	Taft
Fulbright	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
George	McGrath	Thomas, Utah
Green	McKellar	Thye
Gurney	McMahon	Tobey
Hatch	Malone	Tydings
Hawkes	Martin	Vandenberg
Hayden	Maybank	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wherry
Hoey	Moore	White
Holland	Morse	Wiley
Ives	O'Connor	Williams
Jenner	O'Daniel	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the order of the day, the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon, at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes a. m., the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler), its Sergeant at Arms (Edward F. McGinnis), and the President pro tempore proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to attend the ceremonies commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the liberation of Cuba.

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to express on behalf of the Senate to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and his associates the Senate's gratitude for the very able manner in which today's ceremonies were planned and executed. [Applause.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD (S. Doc. No. 147)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of